

AD-A097 222 CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING RESEARCH LAB (ARMY) CHAMPAIGN IL F/G 12/1  
LIFE-CYCLE COST DATABASE DESIGN AND SAMPLE DATA DEVELOPMENT.(U)  
FEB 81 R D NEATHAMMER


CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING RESEARCH LAB (ARMY) CHAMPAIGN IL F/6 12/1  
LIFE-CYCLE COST DATABASE DESIGN AND SAMPLE DATA DEVELOPMENT.(U)  
FEB 81 R D NEATHAMMER

UNCLASSIFIED 4A762731AT41

NIL

134  
 612 A  
 09 24 27

END  
DATE  
FILMED  
5-8-1  
DTIC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART  
NBS 1010-A

construction  
engineering  
research  
laboratory

**LEVEL II**

B S (12)




United States Army  
Corps of Engineers  
... Serving the Army  
... Serving the Nation

Interim Report P-120  
February 1981

AD A 097 222

LIFE-CYCLE COST DATABASE  
DESIGN AND SAMPLE  
DATA DEVELOPMENT



by  
R.D. Neathammer

DTIC  
ELECTE  
S APR 02 1981 D  
F



Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

81 4 01 020

DTIC FILE COPY

The contents of this report are not to be used for advertising, publication, or promotional purposes. Citation of trade names does not constitute an official indorsement or approval of the use of such commercial products. The findings of this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

***DESTROY THIS REPORT WHEN IT IS NO LONGER NEEDED  
DO NOT RETURN IT TO THE ORIGINATOR***

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 14 CERL-IR-P-120	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A097 222	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) 6 LIFE-CYCLE COST DATABASE DESIGN AND SAMPLE DATA DEVELOPMENT.		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED INTERIM 704 09
7. AUTHOR(s) 10 E. D. Neathammer Robert		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U. S. ARMY CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING RESEARCH LABORATORY P.O. Box 4005, Champaign, IL 61820		9. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
10. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 11 U. S. ARMY CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING RESEARCH LABORATORY P.O. Box 4005, Champaign, IL 61820		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 16 4A762731AT41-A-033
11. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE 11 February 1981
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 63
		14. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Copies are obtainable from the National Technical Information Service Springfield, VA 22151		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) life cycle costs buildings military facilities		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This report documents the first two phases of a study to design a Life-Cycle Cost (LCC) database that will provide cost-effective procedures for collecting and presenting maintenance and repair (M&R) data for Army facilities. The first two phases of the study were (1) problem definition and prior work analysis, and (2) data collection feasibility evaluation. Installation and District designers/planners require different levels of M&R data than OCE planners to do their work most effectively. Thus, two databases with different levels of detail are required. Collection of data could be done in two		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

405 277

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

Block 20 continued.

ways: (1) implementing a one-time data collection program at eight installations to collect M&R information across age groups of buildings and types of construction, or (2) analyzing Integrated Facilities System (IFS) tapes from a sample group of installations. *Because of problems in both of these methods, it was determined that the best means of obtaining data for a database at the present time is by contract, using engineered performance standards taken from Army publications.*

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

## FOREWORD

This research was conducted for the Directorate of Military Programs, Office of the Chief of Engineers (OCE), under RDT&E Program 6.27.31A, Project 4A762731AT41; Task A, "Planning and Design"; Work Unit 033; "Life Cycle Cost Data Base."

The work was performed by the Facilities Systems Division (FS) of the U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (CERL).

Dr. Larry Schindler was the OCE Technical Monitor. Administrative support was provided by Mr. E. A. Lotz, Chief of the Facilities Systems Division.

COL L. J. Circeo is Commander and Director of CERL, and Dr. L. R. Shaffer is Technical Director.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A	

## CONTENTS

DD FORM 1473	1
FOREWORD	3
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	5
1 INTRODUCTION.....	7
Background	
Purpose	
Approach	
Scope	
Mode of Technology Transfer	
2 PROBLEM DEFINITION.....	9
3 SUMMARY OF PRIOR WORK.....	10
4 PRESENT STUDY - APPROACH AND RESULTS.....	12
Approach	
Results	
Summary	
5 IFS DATA ANALYSIS.....	16
6 RED BOOK ANALYSIS.....	24
Description of Red Book Data	
Results of Data Analysis	
Interim Programming Database for M&R Costs	
Refinement to IPD	
7 ENGINEERED PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.....	37
8 DATABASE DESIGN.....	39
9 CONCLUSIONS.....	44
APPENDIX A: District Office Survey Questionnaire	45
APPENDIX B: Summary of the Life-Cycle Cost Database Workshop	
23-24 July 1979	51
APPENDIX C: Problems in Collecting and Using Data From	
Army Installations	55
APPENDIX D: FY79 Red Book Data for Fort Sill	57
DISTRIBUTION	



## TABLES

<u>Number</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Fort Sill - FY78 Data	20
2	Fort Sill - FY79 Data	21
3	Fort Knox - FY78 Data	22
4	Fort Knox - FY79 Data	23
5	List of Installations Used in Red Book Analysis	26
6	Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis on Red Book Data	28
7	Maintenance and Repair Costs for Types of Buildings for 35 Selected Installations for FY77-79	29
8	Average Dollar Cost Per Unit Area for FY79 by Building Type for Each MACOM and Each Geographical Region	34
9	Estimated M&R Cost Per Unit Area	35
10	Heating and Air-Conditioning (HAC) Costs at the 35 Installations	36
11	Ranking of Building Components	37
B1	Workshop Attendees	54

## FIGURES

1	Sample Page From an R&D\$ Report	17
2	Sample Printout of CERL Analysis Program	18
3	Design of Interim Programming Database	25
4	Database for Floor Coverings	40
5	Database for Heat Generation Systems	41
6	Database for Heating/Cooling Distribution Systems	42
7	Database for Cooling Generation Systems	43

## LIFE-CYCLE COST DATABASE DESIGN AND SAMPLE DATA DEVELOPMENT

### 1 INTRODUCTION

#### Background

Life-cycle cost (LCC) analysis is a costing technique used to evaluate alternative construction materials, systems, and designs. The Department of Defense Construction Criteria Manual 4270.1-M<sup>1</sup> requires use of this technique during the design phase of any new military construction project, with documentation required for projects exceeding \$300,000. Engineer Technical Letter 1110-3-296<sup>2</sup> provides policy for conducting LCC-based economic studies as part of the design process. Implementation of procedures discussed in the above documents requires consideration of all costs (before, during, and after construction) associated with selection of design materials, systems, subsystems, and components over the life of a facility. These include maintenance, repair, operational, custodial, demolition, salvage, design, and construction costs.

Initial design and construction costs, operational, custodial, demolition, and salvage costs over the life of a facility are generally available or can be computed from the architectural drawings. However, detailed estimates of maintenance and repair (M&R) costs over a facility's life are not readily available. Thus, there is a need for an LCC database that will provide cost-effective procedures for collecting and presenting M&R data for Army facilities. Such a database would reduce the amount of time Army personnel need to spend on LCC data collection and thus substantially reduce the amount of money spent on LCC.

This study consists of three phases: (1) problem definition and prior work analysis, (2) data collection feasibility evaluation, and (3) development and implementation of data collection procedures.

#### Purpose

The purpose of this phase of the research was to identify LCC data needs of Army personnel and to evaluate the feasibility of obtaining the information necessary for LCC databases from various existing sources.

<sup>1</sup> Construction Criteria Manual, DOD 4270.1-M (Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, 1 October 1972).

<sup>2</sup> Economic Studies, Engineer Technical Letter 1110-3-296 (Office of the Chief of Engineers, 11 October 1978).

## Approach

As much information as possible that might be useful for the databases was obtained through a literature search and through contacts with government agencies and private firms. A questionnaire was sent to seven Corps District Offices to obtain the opinions of their personnel on LCC data needs. In addition, a workshop was held to obtain guidance for future work on the databases. Data collection procedures, including the IFS, were examined. Red Book and IFS data were analyzed to see if they could be useful sources of information for the databases. Finally, a method of using Engineered Performance Standards with M&R requirements to develop the databases was investigated. Chapter 3 summarizes work prior to FY79, while Chapter 4 summarizes FY79-80 results. Chapter 5 presents details of using IFS data from two installations and Chapter 6 presents detailed analyses of Red Book data. Chapter 7 discusses use of engineered performance standards and Chapter 8 presents the database design. Conclusions are given in Chapter 9.

## Scope

The most difficult aspect of designing the LCC databases is the data collection procedure. The design (format, level of detail, items to include) is trivial compared to the problem of actually collecting reliable data in a cost-effective manner. Thus, most of this report concerns data collection methods.

## Mode of Technology Transfer

The information in this report will be disseminated as part of a new Technical Manual.

## 2 PROBLEM DEFINITION

In FY79, the Army spent \$632 million for M&R of buildings (including air-conditioning and heating plants).<sup>3</sup> This is 27 percent of the \$2,335 million spent by the Army to operate and maintain all of its facilities. It is obvious that LCC of buildings is a major concern to the Army and that reducing M&R costs for buildings will produce substantial savings.

DOD Construction Criteria Manual 4270.1-M recognizes the problem of reducing ownership costs and requires LCC analyses on all new projects, with documentation required in the project file for projects of \$300,000 or more. Engineering Technical Letter 1110-3-296 provides policies on performing LCC economic studies; however, it does not provide detailed procedures, such as equations, and contains no LCC data.

Thus, regulations require LCC analyses, but designers/planners must develop their own estimates of M&R costs. This results in an unnecessarily time-consuming and costly work effort and leads to inconsistencies when similar design evaluations are done by different persons. The designers need a detailed database of M&R costs in order to compute LCC costs for design alternatives and to maintain consistency among several analyses.

Planners at the installation level also need M&R data to justify new construction versus modification of existing facilities. Such a justification requires an LCC analysis; however, the M&R data needed is at a grosser level than that required by the designers.

OCE planners also require M&R cost data for the various types of facilities on a summary level for use in planning and for responding to Congressional queries.

A database must be designed that contains M&R cost information for various building types; this database must meet the needs of (1) OCE planners and (2) designers and planners at the installation and District levels. In fact, two or three different databases may be required to satisfy the needs of these three groups of users. Once the design is formulated, the feasibility of obtaining the data must be addressed.

---

<sup>3</sup> Facilities Engineering Annual Summary of Operations, Fiscal Year 1979, (Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, 1980).

### 3 SUMMARY OF PRIOR WORK

Much prior work applicable to an LCC database design has been documented in two CERL technical reports.<sup>4</sup> Results of this and other prior work are summarized below:

1. A survey of 51 designers/planners in five Districts determined the type of LCC data needed and the availability of such data. (Results of this survey are discussed with those of a similar survey done in FY79 in Chapter 4.)

2. The U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (CERL) studied the problem of obtaining very detailed M&R data from Facilities Engineers (FEs) at several installations. It was found that FEs did not have records sufficiently complete or detailed to compute LCC. The conclusion was that someone would have to be stationed at the installation to coordinate data collection activities.

In 1975, a coordinator was stationed at Fort Ord, CA, to collect data on selected sample facilities for 1 year. It was then concluded that M&R data can be obtained at the installation level, but not without first modifying the existing FE work management system (DA Pamphlet 420-6)<sup>5</sup> and the Integrated Facilities System (IFS).<sup>6</sup> Three major problems were encountered with the data collection:

- a. The work orders were deficient in LCC data.
- b. Descriptions on the work orders of tasks performed were often ambiguous.
- c. Work performed was not easily correlated to the facility components list.

Items frequently omitted from the work orders were location of work, quantity and cost of materials, and specific work descriptions. Ambiguous descriptions made it difficult to properly allocate labor and equipment costs to specific facility components. Cost data were questionable, since actual material costs were not regularly recorded on the work order forms. This was especially true for service orders (SOs) because they typically used shop stock.

<sup>4</sup> J. G. Kirby, Life Expectancy of Structures, Preliminary Report A-14/760489 (U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory [CERL]), April 1973; E. K. C. Lee, J. G. Kirby, and J. M. Grgas, Information and Retrieval System for Life Expectancy of Facilities, Technical Report P-22/AD#782912 (CERL, May 1974).

<sup>5</sup> Resources Management System, DA Pamphlet 420-6 (Office of the Chief of Engineers, 15 May 1978).

<sup>6</sup> Integrated Facilities System, 18-1-B-AKA (U.S. Army Computer Systems Command, 1978; changes 1 April 1979, 1 February 1979).

An additional problem compounded the difficulties listed above; the person hired and trained to coordinate the work quit after 6 months, so another person had to be hired and trained.

Although this trial data collection effort was not completely successful, such on-site collection is believed to be feasible. A coordinator could be stationed at eight installations (two in each of four geographic regions to determine the effects of climate). Evaluation of such effects is needed to insure validity of inferences drawn from the data. Detailed, highly accurate data could be collected on a sample group of buildings. To compare the effects of age and types of construction would require about 5 years of data. This would be a one-time program and would cost about \$1 million. This cost, plus the major problem of varying levels of M&R at different installations, makes this method unacceptable.

3. Contacts with other government agencies and private companies showed that no LCC database existed.

4. The UNIFORMAT method of coding facility components and subcomponents was determined to be appropriate for a highly detailed database.

5. Obtaining data at a level below facility components (roofs, floors, heating system, etc.) would require modification of either the FE manual system or IFS; i.e. obtaining data on various types of floor coverings or roofs would require changing the existing data recording/collection systems. These changes would require more effort from the FE staff and would greatly change the recordkeeping for buildings having multiple types of one component.

#### 4 PRESENT STUDY - APPROACH AND RESULTS

##### Approach

The (FY79-80) study was set up to design the database and develop sample data, using information from Districts, FEs, and private organizations. This involved performing a literature search and contacting private firms, other government agencies, trade associations, District offices, and FEs.

##### Results

An exhaustive literature search revealed no available detailed database of M&R costs.

Contacts were made with the following Government agencies and private organizations to determine if any LCC databases exist or are being planned:

American Inst. of Architects	U.S. Air Force (Engrg. & Const. Div.)
Booz-Allen and Hamilton	U.S. Navy (NAVFAC)
Chanute AFB	U.S. Postal Service
Cost Systems Engineer, Inc.	OCE
Federal Construction Council	Corps of Engineers District Offices -
General Services Administration	Baltimore, Fort Worth, Mobile, New York
Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare	Norfolk, Omaha, Sacramento, Savannah
National Bureau of Standards	U.S. Army Forts Benning, Bragg,
Smith, Hinchman & Grylls	Campbell, Leonard Wood, Knox, Sill
Various Trade Associations (30)	

From these contacts, it was ascertained that the only known detailed database is one at Cost Systems Engineer, Inc.; details about this database could not be obtained, but it is known that it is based on data from hotel operators and housing development operators.

It was found that the private sector typically either uses a percentage of initial costs to estimate annual operating and maintenance (O&M) costs or develops required data on a project-by-project basis.

In 1979, a questionnaire was sent to several branches of seven Corps District offices to determine their opinions on LCC data. The following branches responded:

<u>District</u>	<u>Branches Responding</u>
Baltimore	Architectural, Electrical, Mechanical, Structural, Estimating
Kansas City	Architectural, Electrical, Mechanical, Structural, Estimating & Specifications
Mobile	Architectural, Electrical, Mechanical, Structural, Environmental Control, Environmental Site
Norfolk	Architectural, Electrical, Mechanical, Structural, Estimating
Omaha	Architectural, Electrical, Mechanical, Structural, Estimating
Sacramento	Architectural, Electrical, Mechanical, Structural

<u>District</u>	<u>Branches Responding</u>
Savannah	Architectural, Electrical, Mechanical, Structural, Cost Engineering

A similar survey of 51 personnel in five Districts had been done in FY75. A comparison revealed that results of the two surveys were very similar. Appendix A provides a copy of the 1979 questionnaire, and shows the percent responses given for each question. Results of the questionnaire indicated that the respondents prefer data to be:

1. Grouped by installation.
2. Categorized by facility type (BOQs, administration, etc.).
3. Given for type of component, such as LCC of vinyl asbestos tile, nylon carpet, oak strip floor, etc.
4. Given as an average cost (\$/SF/yr).
5. Expressed in terms of per-unit cost of materials, installation, maintenance, and equipment rental cost.

In addition, the respondents felt that their current data sources do not have the potential for Corps-wide use. The District personnel believe that cooling systems, heating systems, exterior walls, and lighting fixtures have greatest potential for M&R cost savings, while flooring, cooling systems, roof surfaces, and heating systems are the most expensive M&R items.

A workshop was held in July 1979 with representatives from District offices, installations, other Federal agencies, private industry, universities, and the Office of the Chief of Engineers (OCE). The workshop was held to review progress on the work unit and to provide a consensus on the database design and guidance for future efforts. Appendix B summarizes the results of the workshop. The most important conclusions were:

1. The databases should not be comprehensive for all types of building components and subcomponents.
2. Detailed databases should be designed and developed primarily for building components (a) which require large amounts of Army M&R dollars which are reducible through design, and (b) which are high-quantity or damage-propagating.
3. The databases should not be computerized.
4. IFS data from sample installations and the 5-year MCA plan should be used to determine which components should be studied initially.
5. Detailed data may be obtainable from FE staffs or by use of maintenance standards.



The results described above were used as the basis for FY80 work. Results of the FY80 effort are given in Chapters 5 through 8 of this report, with a summary given below.

### Summary

Two distinct databases are needed for Corps of Engineers LCC analyses. A detailed database is required for building components so that designers can expeditiously compute accurate and consistent LCCs for alternative building designs. Planners/programmers need a programming database for various types, ages, and construction types of facilities for justifying new construction and evaluating M&R cost trends.

### *Detailed Database*

Figures 4 through 7 show the database structure for four building components. Data can be collected either from Army installations or by developing preventive maintenance schedules, and expected repair schedules, and using engineered performance standards\* (EPS) to determine required labor hours.

Data collected from Army installations might be more reliable because it is based on real Army experience. The major drawback is that installations have different maintenance levels because of amount of funds, FE philosophy, command philosophy, and user differences. Collection of such data would be best accomplished through IFS, since the system is now being used at all major installations. However, IFS files presently do not contain data for M&R done by contract. Also, when a building has several types of a component (e.g., concrete floor finish, wood, and vinyl asbestos tile), costs cannot be assigned to the correct type. The second way of collecting data is to employ someone whose job is to collect all data for a sample of buildings. This would involve checking the accuracy and completeness of all Service Orders, Individual Job Orders, and Standing Operations Orders for the sample buildings. In addition, the buildings would be checked frequently to determine the value of any "self help" performed. An appropriate sample size is 320 and is computed as follows:

$$4 \text{ age groups} \times 8 \text{ facility types} \times 10 \text{ buildings} = 320$$

To estimate time trends, the data would be collected for 5 years to allow replacement of one-third of long-life (15-year) components. It also gives 5 years of data for items requiring yearly M&R. An estimate of the cost is:

$$8 \text{ installations} \times \$14,000 \text{ (GS-7 salary)} \times 1.70 \text{ (overhead)} \times 5 \text{ years} = \$952,000$$

There are no personnel currently available in FE organizations for this work. OCE would either have to provide an additional personnel space or contract the data collection.

---

\* Engineered performance standards are given in a series of Technical Bulletins 420-1, 420-2, 420-3, etc. These standards give times required to perform maintenance work. They are based on observation of maintenance craftsmen and use of industrial engineering techniques.

The EPS method outlined below is presently the best way to develop detailed M&R data. For each component:

1. A schedule of preventive maintenance (PM) is determined using the manufacturer's recommendations, the contractor's experience, and other sources.
2. Each PM job is broken into tasks, and the manpower requirements for each task are determined using EPS.
3. The expected failure rate of the component is used to determine frequency of repairs.
4. Each repair job is tasked as in No. 2 above.
5. Material requirements are calculated for each PM or repair job.
6. Yearly total manpower and material requirements are calculated.

The cost for developing data for heating and cooling systems, roofs, floors, electrical systems, exterior walls, windows, and structures is estimated to be \$315,000.

#### *Programming Database (PD)*

There are two ways to collect data for this database: one is to use IFS if and when contract data is included, and the second is to have data collected at a sample group of installations by a person at each post.

If the collection plan for the detailed database is implemented, the data could be summarized for the PD. If this plan is not implemented, a second, less costly plan could be used. The data collector would go through contracts and collect data for the sample buildings not on IFS. He/she would use IFS to collect much of the data (since component-level detail is not required) and would also check on any "self help" performed. A sample of 480 buildings would be required:

4 age groups x 8 facility types x 3 construction types x 5 buildings = 480

It is estimated that only 1/2 man-year would be required, so the cost would be about \$476,000. Since the FE does not have the manpower available to perform this work, the best source of personnel would be a contractor or a retired employee.

Whether such an expenditure is worthwhile depends on the value placed on having M&R cost information for various ages of various types of construction for different facility classifications.

## 5 IFS DATA ANALYSIS

In FY80, IFS data was analyzed at sample installations to ascertain its potential for generating detailed LCC data and for how effectively it could be used in summary form to determine high-cost M&K building components.

The installations with the best working IFS packages and with personnel most knowledgeable in its use were Fort Sill, OK, and Fort Knox, KY, according to personnel at the Facilities Engineering Support Agency (FESA), Fort Lee, VA.

The IFS was examined to determine the level of detail at which data is available and can be made available.

It was found that the Assets Accounting (AA) module contains detailed building component descriptions for roofing, structure, flooring, heating, and air conditioning; however, it does not contain detailed descriptions of plumbing or electrical components. The AA module also contains cost data for maintenance and repair for each facility. This data is accountable to the facility component (e.g., the roof), but not to the part of the component (e.g., the roof's structure, deck, or surface). A description of the work is also recorded on the historical file, and can often be extracted manually and charged to the appropriate subcomponent in another computer system. However, when a building has two types of roofing, it is not usually possible to assign roofing repair costs to the proper subcomponents.

Two IFS computer tapes were obtained from each post for FY78 and FY79. These contained the Recurring Maintenance and Deficiency (R&D\$) Master File (A18AKA) and the Installation Management and Planning File (IM&P) (A09AKA). The R&D\$ tape contains the M&R costs for each component for each facility during the current fiscal year and cumulative costs for that component since IFS began. Figure 1 is a page from an R&D\$ printout. The IM&P tape contains a detailed description of the facility, including its classification, unit of measure, size, type of construction, current use, utilities available, year built, type walls, floors, roofs, air-conditioning and heating capacities, etc. The General Systems Document, Vol. 5, of the IFS documentation describes the contents of these two tapes in detail.

Programs were written to abstract data from the tapes for further analysis. (For this analysis, only data for buildings was used.) The programs were designed so that any combination of fiscal years for the data, facility classification, year constructed, and type of construction (permanent, temporary, semi-permanent) could be grouped. Then M&R costs could be summarized for each building component. Figure 2 is an example of such a summary.

One shortcoming of the data from the R&D\$ file is that it contains only in-house costs. Contract costs (which can be as much as 50 percent of all M&R costs) are not included. Contract files for FY78 and FY79 were examined, and cost data was abstracted and placed into a computer database for joint analysis with the IFS data. There were three major difficulties in abstracting this data: (1) when several components were repaired on the same contract, costs for each were not always given; (2) sometimes, when several

PREPARED INVALID 'R' and 'D' DOLLAR REPORTS - BUILDINGS PCN AKA-006 AED1 A/OF 25 SEP 79  
 INSTALLATION NAME FORT SILL OK INSTALLATION NO. 40755 RELATION CODE 40755 ARMY LOCATION CODE 40801

FACILITY NO. SUF P00050 FUNCTIONAL GROUP 73000 UM 1 SF UM 1 AMOUNT 1553.0

PART 1 - "D" DOLLARS BY COMPONENT

MONTH & YR.	ROOF	STRUCT	FLOOR COVER	EXTER PAINT	INTER PAINT	HEAT-ING	AIR COND	PLUMB-ING	ELECT-RICAL	EQUIP	TOTAL
0776		182								39	39
0577		410								182	182
0677										410	410
0578				452						452	452
0679								805		805	805
D \$ TOTAL THIS YEAR		592		452				805		39	805
CUMULATIVE L \$ CUM.								805		1888	1888

PART 2 - "R" DOLLARS BY COMPONENT

R \$ CUM	ROOF	STRUCT	FLOOR COVER	EXTER PAINT	INTER PAINT	HEAT-ING	AIR COND	PLUMB-ING	ELECT-RICAL	EQUIP	PREV. MAINT	R \$ TOTAL
NO YRS/MOS	46	299				43		1118	12	92	188	1798
NO. EVENT	2	3				3		27	1	2	3	5/ 5
UNIT COST	.00	.04	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.14	.00	.00	.02	.21
R \$ PRIOR YEAR												
NO. EVENT								422	12			434
UNIT COST								14	1			15
PRIOR YR.	.34	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.27	.01	.00	.00	.28
R \$ CURR. YEAR												
NO. EVENT	22	269				12		134			69	506
UNIT COST	1	2				1		5			1	10
CURR. YR.	.00	.17	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.09	.00	.00	.04	.33

Figure 1. Sample page from an R&D\$ report.

21405 FORT KNOX KY										REPORT	1	
FACILITY CLASS 171												
YEAR BUILT ALL												
BUILDING TYPE P S T												
	A/C	ELEC	EXTR	FLOOR	HEAT	INTR	PLUMB	PM	ROOF	STRC	SYS	TOTAL
FY 1970 \$	7712.	36994.	9990.	121.	52147.	41369.	55822.	48235.	2201.	34974.	0.	285165.
UM	.0075	.0358	.0097	.0001	.0504	.0400	.0536	.0097	.0021	0.0000	0.0000	1033823.
\$/UM												.2758
FY 1979 \$	5997.	21110.	12895.	0.	44629.	10720.	10199.	33430.	1027.	24095.	0.	172126.
UM	.0058	.0204	.0125	0.0000	.0432	.0101	.0099	.0125	.0010	0.0000	0.0000	1033823.
\$/UM												.1685
TOTALS \$	13709.	58112.	22885.	121.	96776.	60097.	65621.	77673.	3228.	59069.	0.	457291.
UM	.0066	.0281	.0111	.0001	.0468	.0291	.0317	.0111	.0016	0.0000	0.0000	2067646.
\$/UM												.2212

156 BUILDINGS INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT

Figure 2. Sample printout of CERL analysis program.

buildings were repaired on the same contract, costs for each were not always given; and (3) it was sometimes difficult to determine the fiscal year in which the work was completed.

Tables 1 through 4 show the M&R costs for building types that were derived from the IFS tapes and contract files. For comparison purposes, costs are also given which were taken from the "Red Book"\* for FY78 and FY79. There is a large difference between Red Book costs and the costs derived from IFS tapes and contract files. There are several reasons for these differences:

1. The derived costs do not include contract M&R costs on installed user equipment.
2. Service contracts were not included in the derived costs.
3. Many of the heating/air-conditioning contracts were not found in the contract files.
4. As much as \$900,000 per year of the Red Book costs are pro-rated to the accounts from the K9000 account, which is a type of overhead account for miscellaneous items such as awards, benefits, holidays, severance pay, equipment rental, and some labor. These charges are not made against individual buildings and therefore do not appear in the IFS files.

Table 2 shows the K9000 costs assigned to each building type at Fort Sill. These "residues" are also shown for air-conditioning and heating systems. (Heating and air-conditioning M&R costs are shown as separate items in the Red Book, and are not included in the buildings' M&R costs. (See Chapter 6.)

It is obvious that only local installation employees or someone stationed there for a considerable length of time can find all the contract data and assign costs to individual buildings. This is an expensive process if feasible at all. In addition, the K9000 costs are not assignable to individual buildings. Thus, there is no automated method of obtaining all M&R costs for a building at an installation. The percent derivable costs shown in Tables 1 through 4 can be improved to perhaps 75 percent, but only with considerable expenditure of manpower.

There are many other problems associated with collecting and using data from installations. Some of these are summarized in Appendix C.

---

\* The "Red Book" is the Facilities Engineering Annual Summary of Operations, which contains accounts information submitted by each installation.

Table 1

## Fort Sill - FY78 Data

<u>Building Type</u>	<u>Area (x 1000 Sq Ft)</u>	<u>Red Book M&amp;R Costs (\$)</u>	<u>IFS (With Contracts) M&amp;R Costs (\$)</u>
Training	1734	577078	361532
Maintenance/Prod	1186	384913	161206
RDT&E	11	3119	149
Ammunition Stor	86	3943	932
Other Covered Stor	891	112062	30069
Hospital & Medical	290	211810	113644
Administration	737	197889	262499
Bachelor Housing	4772	2566657	999321
Community Fac	1219	372319	235092
Family Housing	2515	1253675	1037113
Operational	156	40290	17261
Utility Plants	89	49980	27032
Total Costs		5443735	3245895
Heating Systems		2144085	
Air Conditioning		951702	
Red Book Total		8869522	

$$\% \text{ derivable costs} = 100 \times \frac{3245895}{8869522} = 37\%$$

Note: The IFS costs do not include: \$500K in prorated overhead-type costs; contract M&R costs on installed user equipment; about \$250K in service contracts; and most of the heating/air-conditioning contract costs.

Table 2

Fort Sill - FY79 Data

Building Type	Area (x 1000 Sq Ft)	Red Book M&R Costs (\$)	IFS (With Contracts) M&R Costs (\$)	Residue*
Training	1734	972534	578819	23634
Maintenance/Prod	1181	574581	116491	20131
RDT&E	10	5097	10151	634
Ammunition Stor	83	42935	35786	1791
Other Covered Stor	900	202122	140529	7480
Hospital & Medical	283	264920	76492	9061
Administration	782	212431	298267	18605
Bachelor Housing	4709	2331520	1636511	114064
Community Fac	1187	403587	561293	25883
Family Housing	2517	1361116	704135	67882
Operational	156	58358	58701	2988
Utility Plants	89	17587	160462	2100
Total Costs		6446788	4378489	294253
Heating		1471819		285113
Air Conditioning		1439927		203152
Red Book Total		9326642		782518
			Total M&R	5161007

$$\% \text{ derivable costs} = \frac{5161007}{9326642} \times 100 = 55\%$$

Note: The IFS costs do not include contract M&R costs on installed user equipment, service contracts, and many of heating/air-conditioning contract costs.

\* From the K9000 account.



Table 3

## Fort Knox - FY78 Data

<u>Building Type</u>	<u>Area (x 1000 Sq Ft)</u>	<u>Red Book M&amp;R Costs (\$)</u>	<u>IFS (With Contracts) M&amp;R Costs (\$)</u>
Training	2391	973524	285165
Maintenance/Prod	1493	1138353	460424
RDT&E	95	68302	46025
Ammunition Stor	62	13283	4012
Other Covered Stor	1157	176866	241392
Hospital & Medical	476	384237	156920
Administration	556	277451	190643
Bachelor Housing	5596	3728121	2621483
Community Fac	1886	1259698	879202
Family Housing	6218	4512042	3009996
Operational	281	84115	106061
Utility Plants	121	230936	98150
Total Costs		12846928	8099473
Heating Systems		689980	
Air Conditioning		856214	
Red Book Total		14393122	

$$\% \text{ derivable costs} = \frac{8099473}{14393122} \times 100 = 56\%$$

Note: The IFS data does not include service contracts, prorated OH costs, most heating/air-conditioning costs, or costs prorated from the K9000 account.

Table 4  
Fort Knox - FY79 Data

<u>Building Type</u>	<u>Area (x 1000 Sq Ft)</u>	<u>Red Book M&amp;R Costs (\$)</u>	<u>IFS (With Contracts) M&amp;R Costs (\$)</u>
Training	2391	719187	172126
Maintenance/Prod	1493	1061235	768336
RDT&E	95	64416	188762
Ammunition Stor	62	10372	1370
Other Covered Stor	1157	338405	120140
Hospital & Medical	476	734478	134448
Administration	551	228152	102604
Bachelor Housing	5596	3867377	2049755
Community Fac	1886	1077550	765995
Family Housing	6218	1852008	3313906
Operational	261	105571	127211
Utility Plants	121	193687	115836
Total Costs		12252438	7860489
Heating Systems		985959	
Air Conditioning		899947	
Red Book Total		14138344	

$$\% \text{ derivable costs} = \frac{7860489}{14138344} = 56\%$$

Note: The IFS data does not include service contracts, prorated OH costs, most heating/air-conditioning costs, or costs prorated from the K9000 account.

## 6 RED BOOK ANALYSIS

One product of the current work was to be an Interim Programming Database (IPD) showing M&R costs for different building types, preferably by type of construction. Figure 3 shows the database design.

By definition, the data in the database is summary in nature. In designing the IPD, the first approach was to determine the feasibility of obtaining valid, detailed data on a building-by-building basis for a small number of installations. This detailed data could then be "rolled up" to the desired level of summary. The detailed data would also be used to design a detailed database for designers to use. As discussed in Chapter 5, the IFS data analysis effort was not successful. The second approach was to thoroughly analyze data in the Red Book even though it is on a grosser level than desired.

### Description of Red Book Data

Each installation annually submits a Facilities Engineering Technical Data Report (DA Form 2788-R) to the Office of the Chief of Engineers (OCE). The data in this report are put into the Red Book. The "K" accounts data are the best available on funds spent for M&R. All M&R funds expended at an installation are given in the Red Book; however, there are some shortcomings in this data. One is that some costs shown in the M&R costs for building types are of an indirect, prorated nature. For example, at Fort Sill in FY79, \$114,064 of the \$1,357,894 in-house costs for K2700 (Bachelor Housing) were prorated and not directly attributable to work performed on Bachelor Housing. Thus, as listed, the costs per building type are for more than direct labor, normal overheads, material, and equipment. Since they are too large, they can be of use only as upper limits of M&R cost estimates for use in planning. The second major drawback is that heating and air-conditioning (A/C) M&R costs are separated from the type of building in which the A/C systems are actually located. Appendix D, which provides the FY79 data for Fort Sill, shows the heating and A/C M&R costs in accounts K1410-K1443 and K1510-1540, and shows building-type M&R costs in accounts K2110-K2990.

Red Book data for 35 installations were analyzed to determine if statistically significant differences exist, e.g., (1) differences among MACOMs would indicate varying M&R philosophies and/or user characteristics; (2) differences among geographical regions would indicate a need for adjustment factors to account for varying climatic conditions and soil compositions; and (3) differences among fiscal years (FY77-FY79 were analyzed) would show trends over time caused by inflation and/or deteriorating inventory.

Table 5 lists the 35 installations studied in the Red Book analysis, their MACOMs, and their geographical regions. For FY79, the total M&R cost for buildings was \$196.0 million, or 63 percent of the total \$312 million expended for buildings M&R in the Continental United States (CONUS) in FY79. The heating and A/C M&R costs were \$36.0 million, or 64 percent of the CONUS total of \$56.0 million.

<u>Building Type</u>	<u>Age Group</u>	<u>Type Construction</u>					
		<u>One Story Brick</u>	<u>One Story Concrete</u>	<u>One-Story Wood</u>	<u>Multistory Brick</u>	<u>Multistory Concrete</u>	<u>Multistory Wood</u>
Training	1*	**					
	2						
	3						
Maintenance & Prod.	1						
	2						
	3						
Research, Dev. & Test	1						
	2						
	3						
Ammunition Storage	1						
	2						
	3						
Other Covered Storage	1						
	2						
	3						
Hospital/Medical	1						
	2						
	3						
Administration	1						
	2						
	3						
Bachelor Housing	1						
	2						
	3						
Community Facilities	1						
	2						
	3						
Family Housing	1						
	2						
	3						
Operational	1						
	2						
	3						
Utility Plant	1						
	2						
	3						

\* Age Group: 1 = 1950-59, 2 = 1960-69, 3 = 1970-79

\*\* \$ Cost per Unit Measure

Figure 3. Design of interim programming database.

Table 5

## List of Installations Used in Red Book Analysis\*

<u>Installations</u>	<u>MACOM</u>	<u>Geographical Region</u>
Fort Bragg	FORSCOM	E
Fort Campbell	FORSCOM	MW
Fort Carson	FORSCOM	W
Fort Devens	FORSCOM	E
Fort Hood	FORSCOM	SW
Fort Sam Houston	FORSCOM	SW
Fort Lewis	FORSCOM	W
Fort Meade	FORSCOM	E
Fort Ord	FORSCOM	W
Fort Polk	FORSCOM	S
Presidio of San Francisco	FORSCOM	W
Fort Riley	FORSCOM	MW
Fort Stewart	FORSCOM	S
Fort Belvoir	TRADOC	E
Fort Benning	TRADOC	S
Fort Bliss	TRADOC	SW
Fort Dix	TRADOC	E
Fort Gordon	TRADOC	S
Fort Jackson	TRADOC	S
Fort Knox	TRADOC	MW
Fort Leavenworth	TRADOC	MW
Fort Lee	TRADOC	E
Fort Rucker	TRADOC	S
Fort Sill	TRADOC	MW
Fort Leonard Wood	TRADOC	MW
Aberdeen Proving Ground	DARCOM	E
Detroit Arsenal	DARCOM	MW
New Cumberland AD	DARCOM	E
Picatinny Arsenal	DARCOM	E
Redstone Arsenal	DARCOM	S
Tooele AD	DARCOM	W
White Sands MR	DARCOM	SW
Walter Reed Hospital	HSC	E
Fort Huachuca	ACC	SW
Fort Monmouth	ACC	E

\* E = East, MW = Midwest, S = South, SW = Southwest, W = West.

### Results of Data Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was used to determine whether the differences discussed above actually exist. For each building type, the cost per unit area was the variable analyzed. The model used was:

$$\text{Cost/unit area} = f(\text{MACOM, Geographical Region, Fiscal Year}) \quad [\text{Eq 1}]$$

The analysis showed that cost per unit area cannot be predicted accurately with only knowledge of the three variables in the model. The largest multiple correlation coefficient, R, was .68 for community facilities, using all three variables in the model. This means that  $R^2 = .46$ ; i.e., the model explains only 46 percent of the variation among the data for the 35 installations. Table 6 summarizes the analysis results. Note that fiscal years are not statistically significant for any building type. Thus, there is no detectable time trend for any building type. One reason why the model is not a good one is because the data varies so widely. Table 7 gives the cost per unit area of each building type for each year for each installation. Note the variability from year to year for an installation and across installations within a given year. No model is likely to account for such data variation, so the variability must be accepted when using summary information for planning purposes. This means that although an overall M&R cost per unit area can be estimated for all installations, an upper limit would be so high that it would be useless. For example, for training buildings, the FY79 average = \$0.393/sq ft. An upper limit (95 percent confidence) would be approximately \$0.903/sq ft. (This average is based on total area for training buildings at the 35 installations divided by the total cost for M&R. It is not the average of the 35 costs per unit area.) The FY79 averages shown in Table 8 for each building type in each MACOM and geographical region illustrate the wide differences in unit costs for these two variables.

### Interim Programming Database for M&R Costs

Table 9 presents the best estimates of M&R cost per unit area available. Since such costs vary greatly from year to year at a given installation, the estimates should be used only as guidelines. The estimates are a CONUS average, and any particular installation can vary considerably for a specific building type in a given year.

(Because data from the Red Book cannot be broken down into type of construction or year of construction, the six-category and age group breakdown shown in Figure 3 is not possible.)

Table 6

## Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis on Red Book Data

Building Type	R	R <sup>2</sup>	S <sub>e</sub>	Signifi- cance	Building Type	R	R <sup>2</sup>	S <sub>e</sub>	Signifi- cance
Training	.409	.168	.527		Bachelor Housing	.390	.153	.667	
MACOMS	.300	.090	.540	NS	MACOMS	.267	.071	.684	NS
Geo Reg	.332	.110	.534	NS	Geo Reg	.321	.103	.672	NS
Years	.392	.153	.526	NS	Years	.370	.137	.666	NS
Maintenance & Prod	.545	.297	.354		Community Facil	.680	.463	.252	
MACOMS	.420	.176	.376	S	MACOMS	.361	.130	.315	S
Geo Reg	.328	.108	.391	S	Geo Reg	.611	.373	.267	S
Years	.536	.288	.353	NS	Years	.653	.427	.258	NS
Research, Dev, Test	.534	.286	.389		Family Housing	.491	.241	.337	
MACOMS	.442	.195	.400	NS	MACOMS	.323	.104	.358	S
Geo Reg	.345	.119	.418	NS	Geo Reg	.444	.197	.339	NS
Years	.510	.260	.389	NS	Years	.490	.241	.333	NS
Ammunition Storage	.316	.100	.836		Operational	.381	.145	1.309	
MACOMS	.260	.068	.836	NS	MACOMS	.235	.056	1.354	NS
Geo Reg	.257	.066	.832	NS	Geo Reg	.249	.062	1.342	NS
Years	.298	.089	.831	NS	Years	.370	.137	1.301	NS
Other Covered Stor	.540	.292	.152		Utility Plant	.238	.057	.809	
MACOMS	.401	.161	.162	S	MACOMS	.210	.044	.797	NS
Geo Reg	.412	.170	.161	S	Geo Reg	.125	.016	.809	NS
Years	.540	.291	.151	NS	Years	.228	.052	.802	NS
Hospital/Medical	.313	.098	.619		Other	.518	.268	3.736	
MACOMS	.255	.065	.617	NS	MACOMS	.493	.243	3.672	NS
Geo Reg	.178	.032	.628	NS	Geo Reg	.177	.031	4.153	S
Years	.307	.094	.614	NS	Years	.503	.253	3.708	NS
Administration	.505	.255	.454						
MACOMS	.399	.158	.473	NS					
Geo Reg	.364	.132	.480	S					
Years	.488	.288	.454	NS					

R = multiple correlation coefficient

S<sub>e</sub> = standard error of the regression estimate. Its unit is \$/sq ft. Approximately twice S<sub>e</sub> is the upper 95% confidence limit; e.g., for the full model for training buildings, the upper limit = 2 x \$0.527 + .409 = \$1.463.

Significance - "S" means the variable was significant; "NS" means it was not significant; (e.g., for Maintenance & Prod buildings, there is a statistically significant difference among MACOMS and among geographical regions).

Table 7  
Maintenance and Repair Costs for Types of Buildings  
for 35 Selected Installations for FY77-79

Instal	FY77TRNG	FY78TRNG	FY79TRNG	FY77MAIN	FY78MAIN	FY79MAIN	FY77RDT	FY78RDT	FY79RDT
ANER PR	.269*	.376	.566	.230	.229	.752	.470	.431	.524
FT BELVO	.366	.266	.406	.376	.224	.199	.499	.389	.589
FT BENNI	.183	.333	.213	.478	.236	.478	.013	-0	.004
FT BLISS	.459	.284	.137	.503	.356	.277	.132	.100	.106
FT BRAGG	.291	.143	.304	.290	.270	.302	.013	.049	.064
FT CAMPR	.218	.266	.310	.460	.570	.348	-0	-0	-0
FT CARSO	.341	.202	.285	.366	.317	.484	-0	-0	-0
DETROIT	.369	.358	.718	2.361	2.456	2.369	.645	1.322	.770
FT DEVEN	.434	.478	.407	.434	.840	.466	-0	-0	-0
FT DIX	.402	.618	.449	.420	.327	.515	.592	1.186	.695
FT GORDO	.186	.189	.343	.214	.297	.413	.522	.243	.354
FT HOOD	.688	.396	.770	.845	.138	.170	-0	-0	-0
FT SAM H	.602	.232	.243	.695	.326	.179	.700	.865	.429
FT HUACH	.239	.380	.256	.190	.426	1.075	.219	.651	1.106
FT JACKS	.229	.551	.186	.193	.116	.243	-0	-0	-0
FT KNOX	.355	.407	.301	.491	.762	.711	.656	.719	.678
FT LEAVE	.311	.694	.793	.540	.675	.797	-0	.046	1.624
FT LEE	.405	.383	.755	.266	1.235	.379	.012	.016	.009
FT LEWIS	.117	.141	.164	.164	.202	.372	-0	-0	-0
FT MEADE	.339	.278	.206	.473	.659	.575	.362	.321	.214
FT MONMD	2.515	1.129	.868	.411	.366	.343	.520	.736	1.299
NEW CUMR	5.091	.890	.415	.693	.102	.590	-0	.097	.107
FT ORD	.192	.332	.506	.313	.202	.193	.053	-0	.028
PICATI A	.056	.276	1.074	.293	.310	.520	.385	1.039	.939
FT POLK	.195	.354	.664	.259	.517	.209	-0	-0	-0
PRES OF	.343	.302	.429	.302	.239	.317	1.517	1.484	1.597
REDSTO A	.202	.241	1.053	.452	.275	.651	.176	.291	.157
FT RILEY	.302	.221	.472	.224	.243	.223	-0	-0	-0
FT RUCRE	.223	.215	.227	.230	.220	.280	.122	.135	.318
FT SILL	.587	.324	.561	.348	.325	.487	.041	.284	.510
FT STEWA	.223	.189	.307	.311	.428	1.173	-0	-0	-0
TOOELE A	.084	.088	.192	.430	.295	.659	-0	-0	.557
WALTER R	.227	.127	-0	.846	.629	.586	.617	.835	.882
WHITE SA	.471	.407	.485	.219	.399	.345	.272	.466	.488
FT LEON	.254	.250	.335	.254	.696	1.088	-0	-0	-0
Average **	.343	.330	.393	.381	.367	.441	.440	.562	.643
Total Costs (\$1000)	9192	8872	11011	11094	10806	12734	3866	4868	5572

\*\$/sqft

\*\*Averages are computed by dividing the total costs by the total area, not by averaging the data in each column.

Note: -0 means there was no maintenance and repair cost or no area given.



Table 7 (Cont'd)

Instal	FY77AMNO	FY78AMMO	FY79AMMO	FY77COVS	FY78COVS	FY79COVS	FY77HOSP	FY78HOSP	FY79HOSP
ABER PR	.122	.158	.224	.145	.125	.355	.591	.347	.552
FT BELVO	.921	.091	.219	.125	.106	-0	.725	.667	.662
FT HENNI	.120	.119	.123	.159	.220	.097	.863	.952	1.864
FT BLISS	.088	.283	.053	.228	.334	.173	.895	1.057	.964
FT BRAGG	.421	.082	.054	.460	.377	.101	.302	.347	.542
FT CAMPB	.023	.028	.009	.570	.161	.161	.679	.607	.486
FT CARSO	.004	.004	.136	.169	.171	.203	.311	.312	.573
DETROIT	-0	-0	-0	.428	.529	.880	2.446	4.067	2.243
FT DEVEN	.000	.005	.007	.149	.165	.116	1.382	1.350	1.309
FT DIX	1.282	.912	.893	.175	.512	.172	.875	1.313	1.599
FT GORDU	.044	.484	.185	.097	.121	.518	.651	.804	.731
FT MOOD	.036	.031	.008	.316	.125	.066	.478	.367	.433
FT SAM H	.007	.004	.567	.168	.259	.528	.388	.605	.629
FT HUACH	.014	.153	1.528	.105	.312	.289	.570	.597	.500
FT JACKS	-0	-0	-0	.066	.118	.080	.686	1.261	.907
FT KNOX	.274	.214	.167	.342	.153	.292	.811	.807	1.543
FT LEAVE	7.634	2.144	.216	.162	.095	.058	.672	.439	.599
FT LEE	.043	.021	.052	.535	.414	.108	.343	.346	.322
FT LEWIS	.025	.605	.082	.086	.107	.064	1.029	1.423	2.868
FT MEADE	.135	.319	.075	.156	.331	.255	2.778	1.465	.879
FT MONMO	.076	-0	.040	.290	.232	.184	1.422	1.077	.729
NEW CUMB	.114	.089	.339	.507	.255	.419	1.362	1.145	1.773
FT ORD	.016	.078	.031	.128	.129	.100	.632	.593	.292
PICATI A	.234	.087	1.283	.231	.495	.714	-0	-0	-0
FT POLK	.492	.153	.120	.379	.129	.122	.522	.490	.417
PRES OF	.059	.357	.027	.195	.193	.261	.919	.814	.890
REDSTO A	.020	.041	.032	.028	.036	.265	.403	.671	.397
FT RILEY	.109	.027	.084	.379	.436	.077	.475	.235	.434
FT RUCKE	.121	.112	.149	.098	.052	.075	.343	.228	.621
FT SILL	.129	.046	.517	.329	.141	.225	.633	.730	.936
FT STEMA	.128	.056	.131	.160	.289	.284	.925	1.888	.529
TOOLEF A	.014	.045	.027	.048	.117	.197	.408	.675	1.287
WALTER R	-0	-0	-0	.644	.791	.365	.960	.625	.651
WHITE SA	.354	.039	.138	.088	.067	.082	.422	.463	.312
FT LEON	.489	.106	.020	.066	.252	.193	.819	1.857	.592
Average	.038	.062	.086	.216	.197	.235	.710	.764	.837
Total Costs (x\$1000)	438	752	792	8106	7517	8080	9947	11933	13000

Table 7 (Cont'd)

Instal	FY77ADMN	FY78ADMN	FY79ADMN	FY77BACH	FY78BACH	FY79BACH	FY77COMM	FY78COMM	FY79CUMM
ARER PR	.327	.444	.624	.731	.776	.715	.549	.659	1.059
FT BELVO	.689	.621	.859	.435	.383	.595	.607	.605	.922
FT BENNI	.458	1.174	.559	.551	.458	.762	.385	.383	.245
FT BLISS	.370	.332	.221	.762	.455	.368	.466	.484	.904
FT BRAGG	.575	.335	.371	.557	.393	.320	.534	.215	.335
FT CAMPO	.339	.401	.379	.512	.453	.450	.387	.579	.491
FT CARSO	.371	.344	.495	.516	.351	.493	.358	.342	.564
DETROIT	1.549	2.282	2.044	.674	1.055	.885	.791	1.193	1.595
FT DEVEN	.297	.345	.260	.596	.993	.777	.565	.769	.868
FT DIX	.855	.390	.458	.839	.831	.771	.288	.384	.419
FT GORDO	.325	.309	.397	.536	.487	.723	.409	.307	.340
FT HUND	.445	.144	.240	.439	.373	.462	.364	.267	.436
FT SAM H	.540	.429	.307	.453	.388	.354	.672	.531	.661
FT HUACH	.285	.807	.345	.352	.538	.318	.456	.456	.473
FT JACKS	.425	1.489	.755	.455	.19	.561	.241	.225	.131
FT KNOX	.903	.499	.414	.675	.666	.691	.494	.668	.571
FT LEAVE	1.627	3.202	2.405	2.117	1.073	1.351	.898	.679	.574
FT LEE	.387	.824	.282	.505	.544	.304	.407	1.130	1.157
FT LEWIS	.143	.269	.284	.258	.393	.416	.200	.359	.213
FT MEADE	.471	.809	1.242	.337	.340	.971	.561	.800	.607
FT MONMO	.380	.925	.935	.902	1.239	.943	.498	.322	.308
NEW CUMB	.747	.683	.545	.430	.389	.977	.980	.884	.717
FT ORD	.250	.384	.225	.275	.180	.288	.224	.359	.222
PICATI A	.776	.978	1.334	.957	1.047	6.899	.544	.791	1.106
FT POLK	.499	.685	.366	1.782	.621	.676	.353	.460	.446
PRES OF	.438	.403	.597	.351	.355	.553	.497	.432	.541
REDSTO A	.461	.603	1.820	1.323	.844	.982	.822	1.135	1.216
FT RILEY	.120	.119	.453	.387	.441	.443	.287	.224	.210
FT RUCKE	.024	.182	.489	.239	.702	.841	.304	.450	.317
FT SILL	.276	.269	.272	.378	.538	.495	.396	.305	.340
FT STEWA	.450	.510	.874	.298	.388	.431	.431	.329	.662
TOOLE A	.519	.483	.662	.609	.908	.491	.315	.551	.439
WALTER R	.412	.561	.181	.513	.358	.303	.421	.333	.180
WHITE SA	.405	.271	.318	.339	.415	.298	.645	1.013	2.305
FT LEON	.313	.636	.473	.618	.476	.381	.205	.293	.257
Average	.468	.583	.632	.543	.494	.536	.422	.454	.497
Total Costs (x\$1000)	11657	14120	15762	49788	47613	53326	12997	14212	15841

Table 7 (Cont'd)

Instal	FY77FH	FY7AFH	FY79FH	FY77OPER	FY78OPER	FY79OPER	FY77UTIL	FY78UTIL	FY79UTIL
ARER PR	.559	.815	.502	.163	.203	.302	.532	.553	.841
FT BELVO	.300	.319	.289	1.331	1.279	.482	.446	.381	.323
FT BENNI	.349	.363	.350	.204	.760	.198	2.711	.147	.240
FT BLISS	.252	.556	.248	.399	.300	.291	.593	1.157	.711
FT BRAGG	.547	.530	.574	.215	.076	.367	.505	1.058	.452
FT CAMPB	.461	.442	.696	.339	.416	.405	.422	.759	.488
FT CARSO	.492	.377	.501	.219	.133	.157	.835	.148	.323
DETROIT	.295	-0	.051	4.754	7.438	4.950	-0	-0	-0
FT DEVEN	.598	.519	.526	.255	.166	.165	.156	.255	.326
FT DIX	.387	.770	.274	.069	.064	.064	.174	.242	.615
FT GORDD	.337	.380	.348	.324	.253	.453	.384	.437	.833
FT HODD	.191	.256	.333	.311	.135	.202	.383	.211	.283
FT SAM H	.590	.572	.512	.525	.408	.474	.451	1.110	.596
FT HUACH	.652	.480	.841	.404	.973	.219	1.369	.951	.190
FT JACKS	.287	.540	.396	.382	.562	.461	.104	.054	.177
FT KNOX	.302	.726	.298	.200	.322	.404	.491	1.909	1.601
FT LEAVE	.528	.534	.599	.328	.280	.244	1.090	.575	3.517
FT LEE	.480	.403	.519	.265	.242	.173	.590	.277	.299
FT LEWIS	.936	.505	.975	.197	.217	.281	.233	.692	1.151
FT MEADE	.315	.995	.339	.407	.542	.670	.701	.445	.868
FT MONMO	.427	.226	.490	.125	.545	.240	.403	.724	.237
NEW CUMR	.302	1.376	1.383	.482	.431	.362	.677	1.841	4.719
FT ORD	.191	.477	.460	.268	.329	.400	.247	2.111	.336
PICATI A	2.714	.937	1.370	.075	.181	.938	.107	.117	.121
FT POLK	.298	.163	.128	.162	.158	10.055	.132	1.777	.384
PRES OF	.390	.667	.669	.175	.209	.370	.987	.306	.795
REDSTO A	.334	.489	.772	.699	.579	.555	.222	.243	1.075
FT RILEY	.228	.357	.271	.072	.159	.070	.419	.195	.722
FT RUCKE	.581	.362	.476	.743	.195	.132	.973	.355	.503
FT SILL	.364	.498	.541	.421	.257	.374	.174	.549	.198
FT STEWA	.484	.433	.562	.327	.205	.154	3.517	1.615	1.582
TOGELE A	.595	.446	.769	.479	.391	.775	.511	.348	.847
WALTER R	2.232	.721	.623	-0	-0	-0	-0	.136	.448
WHITE SA	.667	.743	.272	.612	.404	.257	1.085	.333	.393
FT LEON	.752	.757	1.006	.009	.126	.108	1.072	3.078	1.473
Average	.434	.507	.492	.239	.278	.302	.649	.671	.762
Total Costs (x\$1000)	45465	53216	53717	2636	2395	2499	1943	1970	2225

Table 7 (Cont'd)

Instal	FY770THR	FY780THR	FY790THR
ABER PR	1.138	.580	-0
FT BELVO	1.939	1.656	3.435
FT BENNI	1.221	.319	1.955
FT BLISS	-0	.257	.069
FT BRAGG	.409	.170	.308
FT CAMPB	-0	-0	-0
FT CARSO	1.521	1.295	.067
DETROIT	-0	-0	-0
FT DEVEN	-0	3.191	4.324
FT DIX	6.142	3.741	4.471
FT GORDN	.828	.522	.350
FT HOOD	-0	-0	-0
FT SAM H	1.274	.599	.681
FT HUACH	1.134	2.246	.156
FT JACKS	-0	-0	-0
FT KNOX	-0	-0	-0
FT LEAVE	-0	14.292	16.743
FT LEE	.014	.020	.028
FT LEWIS	.932	2.542	16.213
FT MEADE	.451	.325	1.909
FT MONMO	-0	-0	-0
NEW CUMB	-0	-0	-0
FT URD	.101	4.914	5.528
PICATI A	-0	-0	-0
FT POLK	.002	-0	.005
PRES OF	18.873	5.556	6.281
REDSTO A	1.048	-0	3.254
FT RILEY	-0	.166	1.446
FT RUCKE	.134	.151	.190
FT SILL	6.820	.793	.129
FT STEWA	.024	.139	.158
TODELE A	1.397	2.136	3.905
WALTER R	-0	.012	.012
WHITE SA	-0	-0	-0
FT LEON	-0	-0	-0
Average	.134	.404	.489
Total Costs (x\$1000)	617	1142	1388

Table 8

Average Dollar Cost Per Unit Area for FY79 by Building Type for  
Each MACOM and Each Geographical Region

Building Type	MACOM					Geographical Region				
	FORSCOM	TRADOC	DARCOM	ACC	HSC	E	S	MM	SM	W
Training	.390(13)	.392(12)	.643(7)	.562(2)	--	.545(10)	.427(7)	.498(7)	.378(5)	.315(5)
Maintenance & Production	.385(13)	.459(12)	.841(7)	.709(2)	.586(11)	.475(111)	.440(7)	.860(7)	.409(15)	.405(5)
Research, Dev & Test	.466(5)	.489(10)	.506(7)	1.202(2)	.882(11)	.523(10)	.208(14)	.895(4)	.532(4)	.727(3)
Ammunition Storage	.103(13)	.236(11)	.340(6)	.784(2)	--	.319(10)	.123(6)	.169(6)	.459(5)	.060(5)
Other Covered Storage	.180(13)	.181(11)	.416(7)	.216(2)	.365(11)	.279(10)	.206(7)	.269(7)	.220(5)	.165(5)
Hospital & Medical	.791(13)	.945(12)	1.094(6)	.614(3)	.651(11)	.902(10)	.781(7)	.976(7)	.567(5)	1.182(5)
Administration	.469(13)	.632(12)	1.078(7)	.640(2)	.181(11)	.662(11)	.752(7)	1.920(7)	.286(6)	.452(5)
Bachelor Housing	.481(13)	.515(12)	1.205(7)	.390(2)	.180(11)	.698(11)	.480(7)	.577(7)	.956(5)	.396(5)
Community	.510(13)	.654(12)	1.605(7)	.631(2)	.303(11)	1.234(11)	.711(6)	.671(7)	.358(5)	.448(5)
Family Housing	.504(13)	.445(12)	.731(7)	.666(2)	.623(11)	.626(11)	.433(7)	.496(7)	.441(5)	.675(5)
Operational	1.059(13)	.282(12)	1.163(7)	.229(2)	--	.376(11)	1.715(7)	1.937(7)	.289(5)	.396(5)
Utility Plant	.639(13)	.874(12)	1.333(6)	.213(2)	.448(11)	.840(11)	.685(7)	1.333(6)	.434(5)	.690(5)
Other	3.353(11)	3.401(9)	3.579(2)	.156(1)	.012(1)	2.070(7)	.965(6)	6.106(3)	.289(3)	6.399(5)

Note: The number in parentheses is the number of installations which had M&R costs and upon which the average is based.

Table 9  
Estimated M&R Cost Per Unit Area

<u>Building Type</u>	<u>M&amp;R Costs (\$/sq ft)</u>
Training	.39
Maintenance & Prod	.44
Research, Dev & Test	.64
Ammunition Storage	.09
Other Covered Storage	.24
Hospital & Medical	.84
Administration	.63
Bachelor Housing	.54
Community Facilities	.50
Family Housing	.49
Operational	.30
Utility Plant	.76
Other	.49

Refinement to IPD

Table 10 shows the heating and A/C costs (accounts K1410-K1445 and K1510-1540) and the other building M&R costs (K2100-2990) for each installation. The table shows the percentage of the other costs that the heating and A/C costs represent. Many of the heating and A/C costs are more than 10 percent of all the other M&R costs and should be included in Table 9. If these data are to be useful to OCE, a method of prorating these heating and A/C M&R costs to building types must be devised.

Table 10

## Heating and Air-Conditioning (HAC) Costs at the 35 Installations

INSTALLATION	(1) AIR CONDITIONING	(2) HEATING	(3) OTHER	$((1)+(2))/(3) \times 100\%$
AHERDEEN PROVING GROUND	1160854	1791934	6789740	30.3
FT. BELVOIR	317901	867953	4143497	22.3
FT. BENNING	677323	630523	9554359	12.0
FT. BLISS	335293	620152	5842755	14.1
FT. BRAGG	361678	691874	8780294	10.7
FT. CAMPBELL	165084	1150556	8349546	13.6
FT. CARSON	38369	453435	5150154	8.7
DETROIT ARSENAL	129935	0	1991056	6.1
FT. DEVENS	71984	823695	5672292	13.6
FT. DIX	170695	368547	6259756	7.9
FT. GORDON	625144	658723	4977944	20.5
FT. HOOB	1021124	754958	8306927	17.6
FT. S H HOUSTON	723744	465033	4597211	20.5
FT. HUACHUCA	73015	87134	4389675	3.5
FT. JACKSON	205529	446140	4426301	12.8
FT. KNOX	899947	1021433	10252438	15.8
FT. LEAVENWORTH	189213	377063	5658028	9.1
FT. LEE	194734	632729	3578394	18.8
FT. LEWIS	37597	276872	12144080	2.5
FT. MEADE	172984	400007	6519472	8.1
FT. MONMOUTH	308125	349854	4286010	13.3
NEW COMPREHEND AD	28695	71513	2778038	3.5
FT. ORD	32143	340272	6043823	5.8
PICATINNY ARSENAL	5061	420983	3728634	10.3
FT. POLA	349119	153707	4351797	11.1
PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO	133121	370607	4763233	9.6
REDSTONE ARSENAL	1132979	598704	6860348	20.2
FT. RILEY	234324	526797	4893063	13.5
FT. RICHEN	637089	330607	3890476	19.9
FT. SILL	1439927	1471819	6458387	31.1
FT. STEWART	1130012	1243743	6359211	27.2
MODEL AD	48194	277869	1956882	14.3
WALTER REED AMC	688698	2058073	3011144	47.7
WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE	344071	503226	1985667	29.9
FT. LEONARD WOOD	269451	339575	7224639	7.8

## 7 ENGINEERED PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

The latest approach being pursued for development of the detailed database is the development of M&R requirements through application of experience, engineering knowledge, and manufacturers' recommendations. The three highest cost M&R building components -- heating, cooling, and flooring -- were selected by the following process. Data collected from the two surveys of District offices were combined and then compared to the IFS data collected at Forts Knox and Sill. The building components were ranked as shown in Table 11 and an overall ranking developed. In FY80-81, contracts will be awarded to develop M&R data for a medium-sized heating system, several sizes of air-conditioning systems, and floor surfaces. This data will indicate the maintenance (including preventive) and repair tasks (normal/emergency repair) required on the system for each year of the building's life (25 years). The contractor will use experience, engineering judgment, manufacturer's data, other relevant available data, and Army manuals, bulletins, etc., to determine how frequently preventive maintenance and other repair actions occur. Both the manhours per type of craftsman and the materials required will be determined, the former by using applicable Army publications on engineered performance standards. The result will be a database of expected M&R costs for the building component and its subcomponents over a 25-year period in terms of manhours and quantities of materials required. The data will be in manhours and quantities of materials/supplies and therefore will not be affected by inflation, since cost calculations will be made later by the database user.

Table 11

### Ranking of Building Components

Ranking of Components By Potential LCC Savings, Surveys 1 & 2 Combined	Ranking of High Cost M&R Com- ponent Surveys 1 & 2 Combined	IFS & Contract Data, FY76-79 Forts Knox & Sill	Overall
1 Cooling	1 Flooring	1 Heating	1 Heating
2 Heating	2 Cooling	2 Structure	2 Cooling
3 Exterior Walls	3 Roof Surface	3 Plumbing	3 Flooring
4 Lighting Fixtures	4 Heating	4 Interior Paint	4 Electrical
5 Air Handling	5 Windows & Glass	5 Floors	5 Structure
6 Windows & Glass	6 Lighting Fixtures	6 Electrical	
7 Flooring	7 Exterior Walls	7 Cooling	
8 Steam-Water System	8 Interior Partitions	8 Roofs	
9 Roof Structure	9 Air Handling	9 Exterior Paint	
	10 Gutters & Downspouts		



A contract for developing heating system M&R costs for an administration-type building was awarded in September 1980. Two others -- one for air-conditioning systems and one for floor cover -- will be awarded in early FY81.

## 8 DATABASE DESIGN

The design of the detailed database is straightforward, since it is not possible to obtain/develop highly detailed data. The database needs only enough detail to differentiate among building component alternatives. For example, for flooring, data are needed for alternatives such as vinyl asbestos tile, sheet vinyl, oak strip, etc. Figures 4 through 7 give the design for floor covering, heating/cooling generation, and heating/cooling distribution. These databases will be used by District office and installation designers to compute M&R costs for the various alternative combinations for these three components. The final database will not encompass all 10 building components, but rather only those for which LCC is large enough to warrant inclusion.

This database will meet the primary objective of the LCC Database Design work unit. However, it will not provide all the data needed by installation and OCE planners. They require design LCC data for new construction and LCC data for existing facilities. Ideally, such data would enable the designer to make a statement such as, "a brick, multi-story BQ built in 1950-1960 costs x dollars per square foot to maintain." The design of this planning database is shown in Figure 3.

Building Type	Component Alternative	Use Level			
		Average		Severe	
		Manhours/Sq Ft	Materials/Sq Ft	Manhours/Sq Ft	Materials/Sq Ft
*	01 TILE AND TERRAZZO	**	***		
	0101 Ceramic Tile				
	0102 Quarry Tile				
	0103 Terrazzo Finish				
	0104 Precast Terrazzo				
	02 WOOD FLOORING				
	0201 Wood Strip				
	0202 Hardwood Parquet				
	0203 Other				
	03 RESILIENT				
	0301 Asphalt Tile				
	0302 Vinyl Tile				
	0303 Vinyl Asbestos Tile				
	0304 Linoleum Sheet				
	0305 Vinyl Sheet				
	0306 Nylon Carpet				
	0307 Wool Carpet				
	0308 Other				
	04 MASONRY				
	0401 Concrete				
	0402 Brick				

\* A table will be developed for each building type:

510 - Hospitals	721 - EM Barracks
540 - Dental Clinics	722 - Bachelor Housing - Mess Facilities
550 - Dispensaries	723 - Bachelor Housing - Detached Facilities
610 - Administrative Buildings	723 - BOQs
710 - Family Housing	740 - Community Facilities

\*\* Number of manhours per square foot to maintain and repair the flooring surface each year, given in a range of values. Example: .025-.075 manhours/sq ft.

\*\*\* Number of square feet of surface needing replacement per 100 sq ft of flooring surface per year, given in a range of values.

Figure 4. Database for floor coverings.

Building Type	Component Alternative	Size					
		Less than 750K BTU/HR		750K-3.0 Million BTU/HR		Over 3.0 Million BTU/HR	
		Manhours	Material	Manhours	Material	Manhours	Material
*	01 FURNACES						
	0101 Gas Fired						
	0102 Oil Fired						
	0103 Coal Fired						
	0104 Electric						
	02 STEAM BOILERS						
	0201 High Pressure-Gas Fired						
	0202 High Pressure-Oil Fired						
	0203 High Pressure-Coal Fired						
	0204 Low Pressure-Gas Fired						
	0205 Low Pressure-Oil Fired						
	0206 Low Pressure-Coal Fired						
	03 HOT WATER BOILERS						
	0301 Gas Fired						
	0302 Oil Fired						
	0303 Coal Fired						
	0304 Electric						
	04 AUXILIARY EQUIPMENT						
	0401 Burners and Stokers						
	0402 Tanks and Tank Heaters						
	0403 Pumps and Deaerators						
	0404 Heat Exchange/Recovery						
	0405 Boiler Breaching and Draft Control						
	0406 Boiler Water Treatment						

\* A table will be developed for each building type:

510 - Hospitals	721 - EM Barracks
540 - Dental Clinics	722 - Bachelor Housing - Mess Facilities
550 - Dispensaries	723 - Bachelor Housing - Detached Facilities
610 - Administrative Buildings	723 - BOQs
710 - Family Housing	740 - Community Facilities

Figure 5. Database for heat generation systems.

Building Type	Component Alternative	Manhours	Material
		Per No. Units or Lin. Ft.	Per No. Units or Lin. Ft.
*	01 AIR DISTRIBUTION		
	0101 Fans		
	0102 Motors and Drives		
	0103 Plenums and Casings		
	0104 Coil Sections		
	0105 Ductwork		
	0106 Duct Accessories		
	0107 Mixing Boxes; Pressure, Reheat		
	0108 Filters		
	0109 Humidity Control		
	0110 Heat Recovery Equipment		
	0111 Anti-Vibration Equipment		
	02 EXHAUST VENTILATION		
	0201 Air Exhausters		
	0202 Ventilators		
	0203 Air Make-up Fan		
	0204 Air Make-up Motor and Drive		
	0205 Air Make-up Plenums and Casings		
	0206 Air Make-up Filter Section		
	0207 Air Make-up Motorized Damper		
	0208 Air Make-up Heating Section		
	0209 Ductwork		
	03 STEAM DISTRIBUTION		
	0301 Pipe and Fittings		
	0302 Valves		
	04 WATER DISTRIBUTION		
	0401 Pipe and Fittings		
	0402 Valves		
	0403 Expansion Joints and Specialties		
	05 TERMINAL UNITS		
	0501 Baseboard Heating Unit		
	0502 Convector Heating Unit		
	0503 Induction Unit		
	0504 Enclosures and Cabinets		
	0505 Fan Coil Units		
	0506 Radiators		
	0507 Duct on Unit Mounted Coils		
	0508 Finned Tube Elements		
	0509 Radiant Water Heating System		
	0510 Unit Heater		
	0511 Grills		
	0512 Registers		
	0513 Diffusers		
	06 PACKAGED UNITS		
	0601 Space Heaters		
	0602 Heat Pumps		
	0603 Dehumidifiers		
	07 CONTROLS		
	0701 Thermostats		
	0702 Control Valves		
	0703 Relays		

\* A table will be developed for each building type:

510 - Hospitals	721 - EM Barracks
540 - Dental Clinics	722 - Bachelor Housing - Mess Facilities
550 - Dispensaries	723 - Bachelor Housing - Detached Facilities
610 - Administrative Buildings	723 - BOQs
710 - Family Housing	740 - Community Facilities

Figure 6. Database for heating/cooling distribution systems.

Building Type	Component Alternative	Size				Over 300 Tons Manhours Matl's
		Less 5 Tons Manhours	5-25 Tons Matl's	26-100 Tons Manhours	100-300 Matl's	
*	01 CHILLED WATER SYSTEM					
	0101 Chilling Units					
	0102 Positive Displacement Compressor					
	0103 Centrifugal Compressor					
	0104 Absorption Compressor					
	0105 Chilling Towers					
	02 CONDENSER WATER CIRCULATION					
	0201 Pipes and Fittings					
	0202 Valves					
	0203 Strainers					
	0204 Flexible Connectors					
	0205 Pipe Hangers and Supports					
	0206 Pumps					
	0207 Water Treatment					
	03 CHILLED WATER CIRCULATION					
	0301 Pipes and Fittings					
	0302 Valves					
	0303 Strainers					
	0304 Flexible Connectors					
	0305 Pipe Hangers and Supports					
	0306 Pumps					
	0307 Water Treatment					
	04 DIRECT EXPANSION SYSTEMS					
	0401 Compressor Unit					
	0402 Evaporator Unit					
	05 REFRIGERANT CIRCULATION SYSTEM					
	0501 Pipes and Fittings					
	0502 Valves					
	0503 Strainers - Driers					
	0504 Flexible Connectors					
	0505 Pipe Hangers and Supports					
	0506 Pumps					
	0507 Water Treatment					

\* A table will be developed for each building type:

510 - Hospitals	721 - EM Barracks
540 - Dental Clinics	722 - Bachelor Housing - Mess Facilities
550 - Dispensaries	723 - Bachelor Housing - Detached Facilities
610 - Administrative Buildings	723 - BOQs
710 - Family Housing	740 - Community Facilities

Figure 7. Database for cooling generation systems.

## 9 CONCLUSIONS

The LCC data needs of District designers were identified and data bases for three high-cost components were structured.

The detailed database for evaluating alternative construction materials, systems, and designs will be noncomputerized, since it is not large enough to require automation.

The best method to obtain data is by contract, using engineered performance standards taken from Army publications. Collection of data through IFS is not yet feasible.

Red Book data cannot be used to develop costs per unit measure for various building types because (1) heating and air-conditioning costs are separated from the building types, and (2) the prorating of some costs to the building types results in questionable accuracy of the data. Red Book data can only give approximate overall M&R costs for a building type, since all ages and types of construction are included in the overall figures.

A five-year data collection effort for sample buildings at selected installations would produce data for a programming database. This would require an on-site employee at each installation.

APPENDIX A  
DISTRICT OFFICE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE



## DISTRICT LIFE CYCLE COST (LCC) QUESTIONNAIRE

### PART I - DATA TYPE AND FORMAT

An effective data collection, storage, and retrieval system to support LCC analysis can only be developed if CE district data needs are identified. This portion of the questionnaire is designed to identify the desired LCC data type and format.

#### A. Cost Breakdown

1. Which of the following types of cost data do you feel would be most useful (circle letter)?

34% a. Total cost expressed on a per unit basis (\$/SF of alternate).

66% b. Cost expressed in terms of the per-unit cost of materials, per-unit cost of installation, per-unit cost of maintenance, and the equipment rental cost, normalized to a per-unit basis.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. What would be the best way of presenting the cost figures (circle letters)?

45% a. Average: example: cost = \$.08/SF/yr

30% b. Range of values: example: cost = \$.02 - .08/SF/yr

24% c. Average with confidence interval:

Example: Cost = \$.05/SF/yr  $\pm$  .03 at 95% confidence

(95% of the time the true maintenance cost will be within the interval .03 and .08 \$/SF.)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

B. Location.

1. Would it be desirable to have data available by geographic location?

Yes 97% No 3%

2. If yes, specify grouping (circle choice).

61% a. by installation

32% b. by district

6% c. by division

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

C. Facility Type.

Would it be desirable to have data available by facility type  
(BOQ's, administration, family housing, etc.)

Yes 88% No 12%

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

D. Alternate.

Which level of detail do you feel would be most useful to you in  
performing life cycle costing (circle number)?

22% 1. Least specific detail which describes the alternate. Example:  
life cycle cost of flooring type, such as tile floor, carpet, wood  
floor, etc.

69% 2. Description of type of alternate. Example: life cycle cost of  
vinyl asbestos tile, nylon carpet, oak strip floor.

9% 3. Description of manufacturer's data for alternate. Example:  
life cycle cost of Footstrong "Solarina," no-wax asbestos tile, sunburst  
pattern, yellow.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## PART II - CURRENT DATA SOURCES

The identification and estimated occurrence of currently used LCC data sources will be surveyed with the following questions. A single source of LCC data references will be created by this portion of the questionnaire.

### List of Building Categories

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Foundations and footings</li> <li>2. Structural system</li> <li>3. Exterior walls</li> <li>4. Roof structure</li> <li>5. Gutters and downspouts</li> <li>6. Roof surface</li> <li>7. Exterior doors</li> <li>8. Exterior door hardware</li> <li>9. Windows and glass</li> <li>10. Interior partitions</li> <li>11. Ceilings</li> <li>12. Interior doors</li> <li>13. Interior door hardware</li> <li>14. Flooring</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15. Bathroom fixtures</li> <li>16. Plumbing other than fixtures</li> <li>17. Heating system</li> <li>18. Cooling system</li> <li>19. Air-handling system</li> <li>20. Steam-water system</li> <li>21. Electric circuitry</li> <li>22. Lighting fixtures</li> <li>23. Insulation</li> <li>24. Other _____</li> <li>25. Other _____</li> <li>26. Other _____</li> </ol> |
|--|--|

### A. Data Per Type of Cost.

Is there any difficulty obtaining reliable estimates for the four types of life cycle costs (custodial, annual, cyclical and operating)? Please indicate degree of difficulty by placing the category number in the appropriate column.

	Great Difficulty						Moderate Difficulty					
	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>22</u>
Custodial	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Annual	2	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
Cyclical	2	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
Operating (HVAC)	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

B. Category Potential.

Please indicate which of the categories have the greatest and least potential for cost savings. Place the number on the appropriate line. If you believe a category has greatest or least potential for cost savings only for certain facility types or utilizations, please indicate this limitation in parentheses.

Great potential \_\_\_\_\_

Least potential \_\_\_\_\_

List of LCC Estimate Sources

- |                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. Facility Engineer    | 7. Private research                          |
| 2. Trade association    | 8. Government publications                   |
| 3. Manufacturer's data  | 9. Information from architects/<br>engineers |
| 4. Professional society | 10. Other _____                              |
| 5. Government research  | 11. Other _____                              |
| 6. University research  |  |

C. From the preceding list of cost estimating sources, indicate how often you use each source in making LCC estimates by placing the source's number on the appropriate line.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Extensively used _____	48%	17	60	6	10	0	17	10	33
Moderately used _____	16	30	23	28	10	14	20	30	77
Only used a little _____	32	30	4	11	20	24	39	50	20
Not used at all _____	4	22	4	56	33	60	22	10	5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

D. Do you feel that any of the sources of cyclical and annual maintenance information you use have the potential to provide a CE-wide source of cost data for a particular category? Yes 12% No 81%

If yes, name the source and the category. \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

1. For each of the LCC estimate sources, indicate the credibility and/or applicability of each source by placing the source letter in the appropriate line below.

Very credible \_\_\_\_\_

Credible \_\_\_\_\_

Not credible \_\_\_\_\_

Unknown credibility \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

F. In addition to developing a data collection scheme that will fill the districts' LCC needs, CERL must determine which categories to give priority for collecting LCC data. One means of establishing priorities may be to base priority on current maintenance expenditures. Please indicate below which five categories (refer to list of categories) cost the Army the most money to maintain.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX B  
SUMMARY OF THE LIFE-CYCLE COST DATABASE WORKSHOP  
23-24 JULY 1979

### Attendees

The LCC Database Workshop was held 23-24 July 1979 at CERL; Table B1 lists the attendees, who included:

1. Personnel from the private sector who provided current experience in LCC analysis and state-of-the-art concepts in LCC database development.
2. A representative from the Facilities Engineering Support Agency who provided information on IFS and its current and future capabilities.
3. A Veterans Administration representative who provided a view of the problem with different emphasis than the Army's.
4. Representatives from the Districts, Divisions, and installations who provided detailed information about their LCC approaches and available data.

The workshop accomplished its objective of providing guidance for future R&D needed to design/develop the database.

### Problem Statement

There are requirements that economic analyses be performed during the MCA process. At the programming phase, justification of decisions such as renovation vs. new construction should normally have some economic basis. At concept design, decisions such as brick walls vs. concrete panels should have an economic basis. In final design work, decisions such as vinyl asbestos tile vs. sheet vinyl floor covering requires an economic basis. In each case, the economic analysis incorporates LCC considerations.

LCC analyses are required by Congress and are necessary to insure that Army facilities are designed economically.

LCC analyses require valid data for which uncertainties (variation) are known.

### Conclusions and Observations

The following conclusions have been made on the basis of information gained during the workshop.

A comprehensive database for all types of building components and subcomponents would be too expensive and is not needed.

A computerized database is not needed.

At least two databases are needed:

1. A database with a gross level of detail for programming/justification purposes. Data would be given for different facility categories and types of construction within categories. This database would be used by installation and OCE personnel.

2. A very detailed database for use by District and installation personnel in final design.

A third database having a level of detail between that of the two databases listed above may also be required by District and installation personnel during concept design.

Detailed databases should be designed and developed primarily for (1) those components requiring large amounts of Army M&R dollars which may be reduced through design, and (2) components which are high-quantity or damage-propagating. Selection of these high-cost items can best be achieved by using data from IFS (and installation records) and the 5-year MCA program. IFS installation tapes with at least one year's valid data can be used to determine those components with high M&R costs for each major facility category. (Check with the installation to verify the costs, since installations may vary somewhat in costing procedures, or some unique occurrence may have inflated the M&R costs.) Through LCC analyses, these high-cost facilities can be compared with planned future construction to select facility types with high potential for M&R savings. A constraint on this procedure is that some high-cost components may not have cost reduction potential through LCC analysis (e.g., plumbing).

MACOMs and installations (through OCE) can use data from IFS for program justification.

The detailed component/subcomponent level database may be obtainable from (1) a survey of FE staffs about their experience with various components/subcomponents, and (2) use of maintenance standards (Army, Navy, Postal Service, GSA, etc.). The questionnaire can also be used to evaluate climatic/geographic differences among installations for components M&R.

The database should have some logical accounting system (such as UNIFORMAT) for building components. The IFS classification system should also be considered for use with the database when this classification is devised.

Some building components/subcomponents interact; the database structure should contain a cross-index system of such interactions.

Labor costs should be expressed in manhours, rather than dollars, to avoid the inflation problem and to avoid varying regional labor rates.

One way of providing benefit cost data to justify the database is to conduct an LCC analysis of a sample of existing CE designs for which no LCC analyses were performed previously. The high-cost components would be LCC analyzed, and the LCC for several alternates compared. This would show what savings could have been made if an LCC analysis had been performed during the original design. Several project cost ranges and design agencies should be sampled. Potential savings can then be estimated by projecting the sample results to the MCA program.



Table B1

Workshop Attendees

'tkinson, J.	Southwest Division	Dallas, TX
Fleming, H.	Veterans Administration	Washington, DC
Gagliano, J.	Fac. Engrg. Support Agency (FESA)	Fort Lee, VA
Grulich, R.	Savannah District	Savannah, GA
Haviland, D.	Rensselaer Poly. Inst.	Troy, NY
Kirk, S.	Smith, Hinchman & Grylls	Washington, DC
Kubo, K.	Norfolk District	Norfolk, VA
McGee, C.	Master Planning Branch	Fort Bragg, NC
Motichko, M.	Engrg. Resources Division	Fort Sill, OK
Murphree, L.	University of Illinois	Urbana, IL
Schindler, L.	OCE, DAEN-MPE-T	Wash DC
Smith, H.	Engrg. Plans Branch	Fort Benning, GA
Wright, A.	Engrg. Resources Division	Fort Campbell, KY
Lotz, E.	CERL-FS	Champaign, IL
Neathammer, R.	CERL-FS	Champaign, IL

APPENDIX C

PROBLEMS IN COLLECTING AND USING DATA FROM  
ARMY INSTALLATIONS

The first problem with M&R data at Army installations is that it represents M&R performed rather than M&R needed. Thus, if \$100 were spent on M&R for a building's floors, it might well be that \$1000 should have been expended. Emphasis varies among installations because of existing building conditions, geographical factors, and command/FE philosophies. Allocation of M&R dollars is thus quite arbitrary and may have little to do with the buildings' actual M&R requirements. To use such cost data, one must adapt the attitude that this is the best data available and that it represents what is being done and probably will continue to be done. Furthermore, it is Army data and represents Army facility use. The use of private-sector data (if it were available) would require development of usage conversion factors.

There is a problem with motivating the craftsmen to accurately record job charges. Most of these workers are not paperwork-oriented, and errors do occur; in addition there must be some apportionment of hours for small jobs.

Contract data is not input to the IFS now, but there are plans to do so in the future. However, there are several difficulties in doing this. The FE staff does not have manpower available to enter the data. Requiring the contractor to do so would increase the recordkeeping and hence the M&R contract price. Allocation of costs to building components will be arbitrary; for example, to repair a floor and adjoining wall requires entering costs for two building components (floor, structure). Contractors do not normally keep such detailed cost data. On general maintenance contracts, the FE representative and contractor walk through a building and note what maintenance should be done. In a given building, the contractor may work on several building components. No detailed cost record is kept; only the inspectors' records show what work has been done.

Sometimes the estimators do not break a job into sufficiently detailed tasks to allow cost accruals to individual buildings or building components. For example, changing filters and oiling motors on heating systems in 50 similar buildings may be considered as one task and charged to one building.

The K9000 account is a major problem in that as much as 8 percent of charges made against building types in the Red Book are not assignable to individual buildings. The K9000 account is used to distribute costs of labor chargeable to more than one detailed account; e.g., costs of awards, interns, some benefits; acquisition, maintenance, and repair of hand tools and personnel safety equipment; and some equipment rental. These costs cannot be entered into the IFS on a building-by-building basis, so the IFS data will not reflect "cost of doing business," but only direct charges to the building.

FE organizations are understaffed. There is little they can do either in collecting M&R data or in assisting others to do so.

APPENDIX D  
FY79 RED BOOK DATA FOR FORT SILL

# ARMY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE CODES

TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

FT. RUCKEN, AL

ACTIVITY CODE	ACTIVITY TITLE	UNIT OF MEASURE	BASE UNIT QUANTITY	TOTAL COSTS	NET COSTS
	ACTIVE FACILITIES	K SQ FT	8,205	\$ 22,585,900	\$ 2,752,7
J0000	OPERATION UTILITIES	POP SERV	20,979	5,500,60	265,35
J1000	WATER SERVICE	K GAL	817,796	106,650	.15
J1100	PURCHASED WATER	K GAL	2,895	4,314	1.49
J1200	FILTERED WATER	K GAL	---	---	---
J1300	UNFILTERED WATER	K GAL	814,905	102,336	.15
J2000	SEWAGE SERVICES	K GAL	523,495	101,744	.19
J2100	PURCHASED SEWAGE DISPOSAL	K GAL	1,503	1,861	1.24
J2200	TREATED DOMESTIC SEWAGE	K GAL	521,992	99,937	.19
J2210	PRIMARY PLANT	K GAL	---	---	---
J2220	SECONDARY PLANT	K GAL	521,992	99,937	.19
J2230	ADVANCED WASTEWATER PLANT	K GAL	---	---	---
J2300	INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT FACILITIES	K GAL	---	---	---
J2400	UNTREATED INDUST. WASTES AND/OR COOLING WATER	K GAL	---	---	---
J3000	ELECTRIC SERVICE	MW	98,545	3,149,216	51.96
J3100	PURCHASED ELECTRIC ENERGY	MW	98,545	3,149,216	51.96
J3200	ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANTS OPERATION	MW	---	---	---
J4000	BOILER PLTS, HI PRESS OVER 3.5 M BTU-HR CAP	M BTU	323,505	1,073,139	3.56
J4100	GAS FIRED	M BTU	313,451	1,025,524	3.27
J4120	OIL FIRED	M BTU	10,114	47,615	4.71
J4130	COAL FIRED	M BTU	---	---	---
J4200	HEATING PLTS, OVER 3.5 M BTU-HR CAP	M BTU	7,917	37,53	4.74
J4210	GAS FIRED	M BTU	---	---	---
J4220	OIL FIRED	M BTU	7,917	37,53	4.74
J4230	COAL FIRED	M BTU	---	---	---
J4300	HEATING PLTS, 750 - 3.5 M BTU-HR CAP	M BTU	54,250	138,336	2.55
J4310	GAS FIRED	M BTU	34,775	72,618	2.09
J4320	OIL FIRED	M BTU	19,475	65,717	3.37
J4330	COAL FIRED	M BTU	---	---	---
J4400	HEATING PLTS UNDER .750 M BTU-HR CAP	M BTU	388,175	997,634	2.57
J4410	GAS FIRED	M BTU	331,625	783,577	2.35
J4420	OIL FIRED	M BTU	56,550	174,337	3.17
J4430	COAL FIRED	M BTU	---	---	---
J4500	PURCHASED STEAM & HOT WATER	M BTU	---	---	---
J5000	AIR CONDITIONING & COLD STORAGE	M	---	---	---
J5100	AIR CONDITIONING PLTS (OVER 100 TON CAP)	TON CAP	2,347	---	---
J5200	AIR CONDITIONING PLTS (26 - 100 TON CAP)	TON CAP	3,349	---	---
J5300	AIR CONDITIONING PLTS (UNDER 26 TON CAP)	TON CAP	9,338	---	---
J5400	COLD STORAGE PLANTS (INCL ICE MFG)	HP (40	45	---	---
J7000	BASE CLUBS/RECR ACTIONS	M	---	---	---
J8000	UTILITIES OPERATION (INACTIVE)	M	---	---	---
J9000	OTHER UTILITIES OPERATION	M	---	2,172	---
M0000	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	K SQ FT	8,205	9,126,107	1,124,36
M1000	UTILITIES SYSTEMS	M	---	2,172,024	---
M1100	WATER SYSTEMS	M	---	256,867	---
M1110	TREATMENT AND FILTRATION	M	---	---	---
M1111	PLANTS	K GAL-DAY	---	---	---
M1112	SOURCE	K GAL-DAY	---	---	---
M1120	WELLS	K GAL-DAY	5,500	61,000	11.20
M1130	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS	M	---	195,115	---
M1131	MAINS AND LATERALS	LINE FT	679,031	58,111	8.57
M1132	PUMPING STATIONS	K GAL-DAY	6,912	12,400	2.20
M1133	STORAGE	K GAL-CAP	2,349	137,114	2.45

9948 5 5,354,125

# ARMY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE CODES

TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

FT. SILL, OK

TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

FT. LEONARD WOOD, MO

BASE UNIT QUANTITY	TOTAL COSTS	UNIT COSTS	ACTIVITY CODE	BASE UNIT QUANTITY	TOTAL COSTS	UNIT COSTS
15,721	28,529,202	2,004.67		12,540	22,811,765	1,819.12
30,305	6,157,429	202.00	J0000	28,660	7,920,700	325.77
1,000,402	250,801	.22	J1000	1,399,584	175,190	.12
1,078,000	223,113	.21	J1100	5,294	5,021	.95
6,273	11,323	1.81	J1200	1,290,720	181,062	.13
761	2,365	3.37	J1500	183,570	6,507	.06
776,372	312,160	.40	J2000	959,703	173,090	.18
77,887	13,649	.18	J2100	14,025	3,404	.25
698,485	298,461	.43	J2200	945,678	169,806	.18
			J2210			
5,125	9,515	1.86	J2220	945,678	169,806	.18
605,360	268,946	.42	J2230			
			J2300			
			J2400			
118,804	2,285,246	19.24	J3000	116,395	2,739,212	23.53
118,804	2,285,246	19.24	J3100	116,395	2,739,212	23.53
			J3200			
59,327	210,800	3.55	J4100	573,207	1,089,400	3.47
59,327	198,283	3.34	J4110	12,974	28,247	2.18
	12,517		J4120	560,308	1,061,151	3.50
			J4130			
301,928	608,602	2.02	J4200	29,364	92,400	3.15
301,928	608,602	2.02	J4210	4,267	11,523	2.70
			J4220	25,117	80,877	3.22
			J4230			
361,720	863,564	2.39	J4300	69,479	201,240	2.90
361,720	858,810	2.37	J4310	21,277	44,882	2.11
	4,754		J4320	48,202	156,358	3.25
			J4330			
747,784	1,359,749	2.09	J4400	828,825	2,520,199	3.04
747,784	1,498,966	2.00	J4410	300,264	955,585	3.18
	64,783		J4420	528,561	1,564,614	3.00
			J4430			
			J4500			
	34,979		J5000		25,452	
8,953	19,463	2.17	J5100	7,847	17,660	2.25
5,523			J5200	1,795		
6,491			J5300	6,420		
300	15,510	51.72	J5400	330	5,742	17.55
			J7000			
			J8000			
	25,648		J9000		8,219	
15,721	15,550,143	1,133.31	K0000	12,940	10,907,545	849.8
	5,430,407		K1000		1,785,230	
	272,710		K1100		21,158	
	5,266		K1110		92,352	
95	5,266	30.60	K1111	6,000	84,383	14.16
			K1112	14,000	1,964	.53
			K1120	3,186	44	.05
	269,024		K1130		18,162	
727,428	250,986	.35	K1131	1,190,116	55,859	.5
10,901	5,443	.24	K1132	11,930	62,443	5.23
2,750	6,995	2.54	K1133	5,500		

9440 1 11,275,000

9440 1 11,031,000

# ARMY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE CODES

TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

FT. RUCKER, AL

ACTIVITY CODE	ACTIVITY TITLE	UNIT OF MEASURE	BASE UNIT QUANTITY	TOTAL COSTS	UNIT COSTS
K1200	SEWAGE SYSTEMS	-	---	409,860	---
K1210	TREATMENT PLANTS	-	---	142,082	---
K1211	PRIMARY PLANT	K GAL/HOAY	---	---	---
K1212	SECONDARY PLANT	K GAL/HOAY	2,650	142,082	69.31
K1213	ADVANCED WASTEWATER PLANT	K GAL/HOAY	---	---	---
K1214	INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT FACILITIES	K GAL/HOAY	---	---	---
K1220	SEWAGE COLLECTION SYSTEMS	-	---	267,758	---
K1221	SANITARY MAINS & LATERALS	LIN FT	596,055	263,069	.44
K1222	SANITARY PUMPING PLANTS	K GAL/HOAY	7,500	4,689	.62
K1223	INDUSTRIAL WASTE MAINS & LATERALS	LIN FT	---	---	---
K1224	INDUSTRIAL WASTE PUMPING PLANTS	K GAL/HOAY	---	---	---
K1300	ELECTRIC SYSTEMS	-	---	127,179	---
K1310	ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANTS	KVA CAP	---	---	---
K1321	ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS OVERHEAD	LIN FT	1,287,683	37,973	.33
K1322	ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS UNDERGROUND	LIN FT	892,101	4,195	---
K1330	ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS TRANSFORMERS	KVA CAP	70,792	16,867	.24
K1340	EXTERIOR LIGHTING	LIGHTS	2,354	62,764	26.67
K1350	SUBSTATIONS & SWITCHING STATIONS	NO. PLTS	4	5,370	1,342.50
K1410	BOILER PLTS, 41 PRESS, OVER 3.5 M BTU-HR CAP	M BTU	150	95,596	637.75
K1411	GAS FIRED	M BTU	143	94,416	660.25
K1412	OIL FIRED	M BTU	11	1,180	107.27
K1413	COAL FIRED	M BTU	---	---	---
K1420	HEATING PLTS, OVER 3.5 M BTU-HR CAP	M BTU	16	2,102	131.33
K1421	GAS FIRED	M BTU	5	---	---
K1422	OIL FIRED	M BTU	11	2,102	190.55
K1423	COAL FIRED	M BTU	---	---	---
K1430	HEATING PLTS, .750 - 3.5 M BTU-HR CAP	M BTU	112	84,506	754.52
K1431	GAS FIRED	M BTU	76	57,311	754.19
K1432	OIL FIRED	M BTU	36	27,195	755.42
K1433	COAL FIRED	M BTU	---	---	---
K1440	HEATING PLTS UNDER .750 M BTU-HR CAP	M BTU	234	146,343	625.94
K1441	GAS FIRED	M BTU	157	93,287	594.19
K1442	OIL FIRED	M BTU	77	53,056	755.27
K1443	COAL FIRED	M BTU	---	---	---
K1451	STEAM AND HOT WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS	LIN FT	43,512	72,258	1.66
K1452	GAS DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS	LIN FT	219,673	18,456	---
K1500	AIR CONDITIONING AND REFRIGERATION	-	---	686,74	---
K1510	AIR CONDITIONING PLTS (OVER 100 TON CAP)	TUN CAP	2,347	117,112	49.94
K1520	AIR CONDITIONING PLTS (26 - 100 TON CAP)	TUN CAP	3,389	235,172	69.74
K1530	AIR CONDITIONING (5 - 25 TUN)	TUN CAP	3,419	215,009	55.24
K1540	AIR CONDITIONING (UNDER 5 TUN)	TUN CAP	5,189	68,118	12.93
K1550	REFRIGERATION (5 - 25 TUN)	HP CAP	132	40,248	305.64
K1560	REFRIGERATION (UNDER 5 TUN)	HP CAP	3,029	39,331	12.97
K1570	COLD STORAGE PLTS (INCL ICE MFG)	HP CAP	85	6,142	72.26
K1900	OTHER UTILITIES	-	---	218,293	---
K1910	HEAT PENT & EVAP COOLING	UNITS	3,867	45	11.64
K1920	LIQUID STORAGE FACILITIES	FACIL	23	5,893	256.22
K1930	INTRUSION DETECTION SYSTEMS	SYSTEMS	50	25,923	518.46
K1940	ALL OTHER	-	---	167,140	---
K2000	BUILDINGS	K SQ FT	8,205	3,890,476	474.16
K2100	TRAINING	K SQ FT	781	177,096	226.74
K2200	MAINTENANCE & PRODUCTION	K SQ FT	846	237,140	280.25
K2300	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT & TEST	K SQ FT	51	16,260	317.25
K2410	AMMUNITION STORAGE	K SQ FT	14	2,092	149.43
K2420	OTHER COVERED STORAGE	K SQ FT	636	47,843	75.23
K2500	HOSPITAL & MEDICAL	K SQ FT	311	193,276	621.47
K2600	ADMINISTRATION	K SQ FT	374	102,926	275.19
K2700	BAHCELOR HOUSING	K SQ FT	2,048	1,756,217	857.51
K2800	COMMUNITY	K SQ FT	866	211,385	244.10
K2910	FAMILY HOUSING	K SQ FT	2,080	943,241	453.48
K2920	OPERATIONAL BUILDINGS	K SQ FT	215	20,333	94.57
K2930	UTILITY PLANT BUILDINGS	K SQ FT	61	31,668	520.75
K2940	OTHER BUILDINGS	K SQ FT	74	14,059	189.99
K3000	GROUNDS MAINTENANCE	ALRE	62,157	433,038	7.04
K3100	IMPROVED GROUNDS	ALRE	16,878	786,844	46.62
K3210	WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT	ALRE	47,000	27,775	.59
K3220	OTHER THAN IMPROVED GROUNDS	ALRE	45,741	48,819	1.07
K4000	MAINTENANCE (ACTIVE)	K SQ FT	45	90,067	2,001.49
K5000	MAINTENANCE (PASSIVE)	K SQ FT	6,817	1,861,475	273.10
K5110	MAINTENANCE - CONCRETE AND BITUMINOUS	K SQ FT	1,427	742,114	520.11
K5120	MAINTENANCE - OTHER MISC	K SQ FT	481	48,834	101.53
K5210	MAINTENANCE - CONCRETE & BITUMINOUS	K SQ FT	3,050	442,028	145.09
K5220	MAINTENANCE - OTHER MISC	K SQ FT	311	10,934	35.16
K5310	PARKING, WALKS, ETC - CONCRETE & BITUMINOUS	K SQ FT	1,039	61,046	58.86
K5320	PARKING, WALKS, ETC - OTHER MISC	K SQ FT	109	10,147	93.09

# ARMY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE CODES

TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

FT. BELL, OK

TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

FT. LEONARD WOOD, MO

BASE UNIT QUANTITY	TOTAL COSTS	UNIT COSTS	ACTIVITY CODE	BASE UNIT QUANTITY	TOTAL COSTS	UNIT COSTS
---	1,114,239	---	A1200	---	81,000	---
---	183,700	---	A1210	---	30,100	---
---	---	---	A1211	---	---	---
52	70,700	1,340.23	A1212	5,500	30,100	0.20
4,200	65,000	15.49	A1213	---	---	---
---	---	---	A1210	---	---	---
---	970,453	---	A1220	---	47,702	---
500,030	927,900	1.04	A1221	801,101	30,400	0.08
2,117	42,400	20.06	A1222	13,104	11,350	0.87
---	---	---	A1223	---	---	---
---	---	---	A1220	---	---	---
---	403,922	---	A1300	---	409,533	---
---	---	---	A1310	---	---	---
1,112,920	60,500	0.06	A1321	1,004,300	200,000	0.11
332,370	123,100	0.37	A1322	200,000	739	---
70,770	85,250	1.11	A1330	80,030	47,141	0.54
3,500	120,175	34.02	A1340	5,307	215,507	39.04
3	1,000	620.67	A1350	3	1,400	400.67
30	21,450	504.50	A1410	379	132,077	350.07
30	21,100	555.47	A1411	30	3,450	101.71
---	300	---	A1412	345	129,219	374.55
---	---	---	A1413	---	---	---
350	330,512	930.30	A1420	50	10,790	100.00
350	330,450	930.24	A1421	22	1,703	70.23
---	50	---	A1422	32	9,051	282.04
---	---	---	A1423	---	---	---
510	370,300	725.21	A1430	113	40,957	307.05
510	370,300	725.21	A1431	43	0,005	201.51
---	---	---	A1432	70	30,292	510.00
---	---	---	A1433	---	---	---
800	730,407	831.00	A1440	205	151,147	570.37
800	730,407	831.00	A1441	53	0,002	100.00
---	---	---	A1442	212	101,305	600.72
---	---	---	A1443	---	---	---
50,000	350,505	2.70	A1451	60,329	37,500	0.47
---	---	---	---	---	---	---
520,905	109,000	0.21	A1452	100,105	4,770	0.04
---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	1,033,225	---	A1500	---	303,050	---
0,953	401,500	51.55	A1510	7,047	35,200	4.50
3,523	370,070	107.77	A1520	1,705	60,500	30.10
2,370	401,270	202.30	A1530	2,235	102,250	72.00
4,112	117,430	20.50	A1540	4,005	3,000	0.01
700	35,002	0.20	A1550	205	000	2.05
1,513	151,171	90.91	A1560	110	10,075	90.01
300	8,005	20.95	A1570	330	101,530	307.00
---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	200,005	---	A1600	---	250,111	---
---	---	---	A1610	---	---	---
0,007	113,000	17.51	A1620	---	---	---
07	2,150	22.21	A1630	52	101,050	1,903.27
70	20,300	419.03	A1640	123	20,111	103.51
---	123,075	---	A1650	---	130,950	---
13,721	6,450,307	470.00	A2000	12,500	7,220,639	570.13
---	---	---	A2100	---	---	---
1,730	972,530	500.00	A2200	1,100	303,000	330.73
1,101	570,501	400.52	A2300	532	570,030	1,000.41
10	5,007	500.70	A2400	---	---	---
03	42,035	517.20	A2500	50	1,043	20.40
000	202,122	224.50	A2600	530	103,700	102.55
203	200,920	930.11	A2700	057	270,057	502.25
702	212,031	271.05	A2800	357	100,010	472.07
4,700	2,331,520	495.12	A2900	4,153	1,500,050	300.00
1,107	003,507	300.31	A3000	1,100	200,300	200.00
2,517	1,101,110	900.77	A3100	3,010	3,030,100	1,000.11
150	50,350	370.30	A3200	023	05,017	107.00
00	17,507	197.01	A3300	105	150,001	1,472.77
70	11,500	120.00	A3400	---	---	---
150,002	1,200,112	0.57	A3500	72,200	010,010	12.70
---	---	---	---	---	---	---
20,700	1,000,000	42.12	A3600	7,501	020,002	100.27
120,101	100,000	1.31	A3700	250	30,750	150.02
125,200	00,700	0.05	A3800	00,017	50,571	0.70
---	---	---	---	---	---	---
50	3,000	60.53	A4000	100	05,051	500.50
---	---	---	---	---	---	---
12,500	1,355,005	155.55	A5000	7,510	000,322	00.00
---	---	---	---	---	---	---
2,530	000,110	55.70	A5100	4,000	025,100	100.10
0,071	50,000	11.00	A5200	077	103,007	100.10
100	5,005	11.20	A5300	100	130	100.00
00	27,000	000.15	A5400	2	---	---
0,220	000,717	222.07	A5500	2,201	02,017	07.07
500	21,310	41.00	A5600	00	17,000	032.23



# ARMY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE CODES

TRAINING AND JUSTICE COMMAND

FT. RUCKER, AL

ACTIVITY CODE	ACTIVITY TITLE	UNIT OF MEASURE	BASE UNIT QUANTITY	TOTAL COSTS	UNIT COSTS
.H5400	BRIDGES, VEHICULAR RAILROAD & PILOT	LEN FT	5,808	\$ 95,067	\$ 16.37
.H6000	MISCELLANEOUS MAINTENANCE	"	---	210,647	---
.H6100	WATER FRONT FACILITIES & WATERWAY	"	---	554	---
.H6200	M, R & A SHOP - MACH SHOP	"	---	53,077	---
.H6300	BLDG RELATED FACILITIES	"	---	177,216	---
.H6400	NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM	FACIL	---	---	---
.H7999	BASE CLOSURE/RIP ACTIONS	"	---	---	---
.H8000	MAINTENANCE & REPAIR (INACTIVE)	K SQ FT	147	---	---
.H9000	FACIL ENGR SHOP SUPENSE ACCTS	"	---	10,987	---
.L0000	MINOR CONSTRUCTION	K JP K	19	1,701,646	---
.L1000	ALTERATION & MINOR CONSTRUCTION	"	---	1,701,646	---
.L7999	BASE CLOSURE/RIP ACTIONS	"	---	---	---
.L8000	ALTERATIONS & MINOR CONSTRUCTION (INACTIVE)	"	---	---	---
.H0000	OTHER ENGINEERING SUPPORT	"	---	6,215,461	---
.H1000	FIRE PREVENTION & PROTECTION	K SQ FT	8,352	5,194,859	342.53
.H2000	REFUSE HANDLING	K CU YDS	170	278,146	1,636.15
.H2100	COLLECTION	K CU YDS	170	241,194	1,418.74
.H2200	DISPOSAL	K CU YDS	171	36,952	216.09
.H2210	SANITARY FILL	K CU YDS	171	36,240	211.93
.H2220	INCINERATION	K CU YDS	---	---	---
.H2230	RESOURCE RECOVERY-RECYCLING	K CU YDS	---	---	---
.H2240	SOURCE SEPARATION OF PAPER	K CU YDS	---	---	---
.H2250	OTHER	K CU YDS	---	712	---
.H3000	PEST CONTROL SERVICES	"	---	93,711	---
.H3100	BUILDINGS	K SQ FT	8,352	76,695	9.14
.H3200	GROUNDS	ACRES	62,167	17,016	.27
.H4000	CUSTODIAL SERVICES	K SQ FT	1,538	624,023	45.74
.H4100	CONTRACT	K SQ FT	1,304	510,541	368.92
.H4200	IN-HOUSE	K SQ FT	154	113,482	736.87
.H5000	SNOW/SAND REMOVAL & ICE ALLEVIATION	"	---	---	---
.H6000	MGMT & ENGINEERING(ACTIVE)(INCL MASTER PLANNING)	K TOTAL	5	1,213,937	---
.H6100	MGMT & ENGINEERING (LESS MASTER PLANNING)	"	---	1,213,937	---
.H6200	MASTER PLANNING	"	---	48,667	---
.H6300	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MGMT	"	---	72,251	---
.H7999	BASE CLOSURE/RIP ACTIONS	"	---	---	---
.H8000	ENGINEERING SUPPORT (INACTIVE)	"	---	---	---
.H9100	MGMT & ENGINEERING (INACTIVE)	"	---	---	---
.H9200	OTHER ENGINEERING ACTIVITIES (INACTIVE)	"	---	---	---
.H9300	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MGMT (INACTIVE)	"	---	---	---
.H9000	MISCELLANEOUS ENGINEER ACTIVITIES	"	---	81,745	---
.H0110	RENTS, INITIAL ALTERATIONS & RESTORATION	"	---	25,139	---
.H0120	LAND PAYMENTS	"	---	---	---
.H0130	EFFICIENCY JUDGMENT	"	---	---	---
.H0200	INSTALLATION OF INTRUSION DETECTION SYSTEMS	NO. INSTR.	6	5,442	907.33
.H0300	FAMILY HOUSING HOUSEHOLD - EQUIPMENT MAINT	NO UNITS	3,032	---	---
.H0410	SPECIAL MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES NON-REINH	MAN-HRS	1,159	16,142	13.93
.H0420	SPECIAL MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES REINH	"	---	135,441	---
.H0500	PACKING & CRATING	"	---	28,474	---
.H0610	FACILITIES ENGINEERING SUPPLY OPERATIONS	"	---	4,138	---
.H0620	INVENTORY SUPENSE ACCOUNTS	"	---	21,476	---
.H0700	PURCHASED FACILITIES ENGINEERING SERVICES	"	---	---	---
.H0800	M&S EQUIP ACQ AND OPEN & MAINTENANCE	"	---	49,446	---
.H0910	M&S EQUIPMENT ACQUISITION	"	---	---	---
.H0920	M&S EQUIPMENT OPEN & MAINTENANCE (NET)	"	52	49,446	---
.H0971	M&S EQUIPMENT (OPEN & MAINTENANCE (OLBIT))	"	---	331,614	---
.H0972	M&S EQUIPMENT (OPEN & MAINTENANCE (CREDIT))	"	---	431,823	---
.H9900	DEMOLITION OF REAL PROPERTY	K SQ FT	---	14,272	---
.H0000	EQUIPMENT IN PLACE	"	---	---	---

# ARMY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE CODES

TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

FT. SILL, OK

TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

FT. LEONARD WOOD, MO

BASE UNIT QUANTITY	TOTAL COSTS	UNIT COSTS	ACTIVITY CODE	BASE UNIT QUANTITY	TOTAL COSTS	UNIT COSTS
2,197	\$ 9,001	\$ 4.10	.K5000	11	\$ 860	\$ 60.91
---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	400,090	---	.K6000	---	270,236	---
---	---	---	.K6100	---	---	---
---	87,003	---	.K6200	---	---	---
---	315,546	---	.K6300	---	270,236	---
45	4,181	92.91	.K6400	---	---	---
---	---	---	.K7000	---	---	---
---	---	---	.K7999	---	---	---
---	---	---	.K8000	---	---	---
---	595	---	.K9000	---	12,257	---
10	1,512,959	---	.L0000	0	623,554	---
---	1,512,959	---	.L1000	---	623,554	---
---	---	---	.L7000	---	---	---
---	---	---	.L7000	---	---	---
---	5,120,551	---	.M0000	---	3,560,146	---
13,721	894,891	65.22	.M1000	12,540	649,777	48.63
313	493,516	1,576.73	.M2000	300	848,513	1,495.04
313	361,673	1,155.51	.M2100	300	349,462	1,031.41
816	131,845	116.93	.M2200	327	139,091	425.35
---	---	---	.M2210	---	---	---
359	19,104	53.45	.M2220	---	---	---
---	141	---	.M2230	---	---	---
1	2,347	2,347.00	.M2240	---	---	---
8	20,632	2,579.00	.M2250	---	---	---
48	81,491	1,697.73	.M2260	---	---	---
---	147,492	---	.M3000	---	143,993	---
13,721	122,004	8.90	.M3100	12,540	90,426	7.21
150,002	75,668	---	.M3200	3,611	13,567	3.76
1,447	742,123	512.97	.M4000	638	304,437	363.29
1,447	734,113	512.97	.M4100	480	208,745	434.89
---	8,111	---	.M4200	358	95,692	267.31
---	118,266	---	.M5000	---	110,115	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---
6	1,720,151	---	.M6000	0	950,049	---
---	1,284,111	---	.M6100	---	866,066	---
---	5,111,111	---	.M6200	---	31,024	---
---	18,111,111	---	.M6300	---	52,227	---
---	---	---	.M7000	---	---	---
---	---	---	.M8000	---	---	---
---	---	---	.M8100	---	---	---
---	---	---	.M8200	---	---	---
---	---	---	.M8300	---	---	---
---	957,112	---	.M9000	---	833,112	---
---	230,119	---	.M9100	---	135,197	---
---	---	---	.M9120	---	---	---
---	---	---	.M9130	---	---	---
2,011	7,126	3,543.00	.M9200	190	16,091	1,37.21
2,053	19,966	13.53	.M9300	4,430	---	---
---	69,746	---	.M9410	---	147,119	---
---	12,432	---	.M9420	---	77,737	---
---	42,880	---	.M9500	---	30,588	---
---	377,112	---	.M9610	---	189,156	---
---	---	---	.M9620	---	---	---
---	---	---	.M9700	---	---	---
---	91,769	---	.M9800	---	190,111	---
---	21,285	---	.M9810	---	19,563	---
---	113,050	---	.M9820	60	170,547	---
---	605,928	---	.M9830	---	477,760	---
---	716,962	---	.M9840	---	377,213	---
---	15,173	---	.M9900	---	42,966	---
---	212,717	---	.M0000	---	215	---

# CERL DISTRIBUTION

Chief of Engineers  
 ATTN: Tech Monitor  
 ATTN: DAEN-ASI-L (2)  
 ATTN: DAEN-MP  
 ATTN: DAEN-MPC  
 ATTN: DAEN-MPE  
 ATTN: DAEN-MPO  
 ATTN: DAEN-MPR-A  
 ATTN: DAEN-RD  
 ATTN: DAEN-RDC  
 ATTN: DAEN-RDM  
 ATTN: DAEN-RM  
 ATTN: DAEN-ZC  
 ATTN: DAEN-ZCE  
 ATTN: DAEN-ZCI  
 ATTN: DAEN-ZCM  
 ATTN: DAEN-ZCP

## US Army Engineer Districts ATTN: Library

Alaska  
 Al Batin  
 Albuquerque  
 Baltimore  
 Buffalo  
 Charleston  
 Chicago  
 Detroit  
 Far East  
 Fort Worth  
 Galveston  
 Huntington  
 Jacksonville  
 Japan  
 Kansas City  
 Little Rock  
 Los Angeles  
 Louisville  
 Memphis  
 Mobile  
 Nashville  
 New Orleans  
 New York  
 Norfolk  
 Omaha  
 Philadelphia  
 Pittsburgh  
 Portland  
 Riyadh  
 Rock Island  
 Sacramento  
 San Francisco  
 Savannah  
 Seattle  
 St. Louis  
 St. Paul  
 Tulsa  
 Vicksburg  
 Walla Walla  
 Wilmington

## US Army Engineer Divisions ATTN: Library

Europe  
 Huntsville  
 Lower Mississippi Valley  
 Middle East  
 Middle East (Rear)  
 Missouri River  
 New England

North Atlantic  
 North Central  
 North Pacific  
 Ohio River  
 Pacific Ocean  
 South Atlantic  
 South Pacific  
 Southwestern

Waterways Experiment Station  
 ATTN: Library

Cold Regions Research Engineering Lab  
 ATTN: Library

US Government Printing Office  
 Receiving Section/Depository Copies (2)

Defense Technical Information Center  
 ATTN: DDA (12)

Engineering Societies Library  
 New York, NY

FESA, ATTN: Library

ETL, ATTN: Library

Engr. Studies Center, ATTN: Library

Army Instl. and Major Activities (CONUS)  
 DARCOM - Dir., Inst., & Svcs.  
 ATTN: Facilities Engineer  
 Aberdeen Proving Ground  
 Fort Monmouth  
 Yuma Proving Ground

## FORSCOM

ATTN: Facilities Engineer  
 Fort Bragg  
 Fort Campbell  
 Fort Carson  
 Fort Hood  
 Fort Lewis  
 Fort Ord  
 Fort Polk

## TPADOC

ATTN: Facilities Engineer  
 Fort Belvoir  
 Fort Benning  
 Fort Gordon  
 Fort Knox, ATTN: C. Roberts  
 Fort Sill, ATTN: D. Hergenrether  
 Fort Leonard Wood

## USACC

ATTN: Facilities Engineer  
 Fort Huachuca

## US Military Academy

ATTN: Facilities Engineer

## USAES, Fort Belvoir, VA

ATTN: ATZA-DTE-EM  
 ATTN: ATZA-DTE-SU  
 ATTN: Engr. Library

HQ, XVIII Airborne Corps and  
 Ft. Bragg  
 ATTN: AFZA-FE-EE

Neathammer, Robert D.

Life-cycle cost database design and sample data development. -- Champaign, IL :  
Construction Engineering Research Laboratory ; Springfield, VA : available from NTIS,  
1980.

61 p. (Interim report ; P-120)

1. Buildings -- costs. 2. Buildings -- life cycles. I. Title. II. Series:  
U.S. Army. Construction Engineering Research Laboratory. Interim report ; P-120.

DATE  
FILMED  
-8